

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, JULY 25, 1863.

THE LAND REGISTRY OFFICE, in Lincoln's-inn-fields, does not appear to be doing a very flourishing business, if we may judge by a return to Parliament which has just been published, and which will be found at length elsewhere in our impression of to-day. Only three land certificates have yet been granted, and there has not been a single application to obtain a declaration of title under Lord Cranworth's Act. The whole amount of fees received up to the date of the return does not exceed £70, while we believe the expense of the office has been about £8,000, of which the registrars and clerks received £4,650 per annum. It appears that thirty-four applications for registration have been made, but it is not shown how far they have been prosecuted, or how many of them were mere attempts or "applications." It would, of course, be unfair to form a conclusive judgment upon the experience of the first year; yet it is sufficient to show either that there was no great necessity for such a measure, or else, if there were, that its machinery does not meet the approbation of the landowners. Soon after the office was opened for business, several announcements appeared in the public papers to the effect that a considerable number of persons interested in land, who had been waiting for the passing of the Act, and of the opening of the registry, had eagerly rushed forward to avail themselves of its provisions. If, in point of fact, the majority of the applications which have been made have come from persons who were thus "waiting" for the new scheme, it augurs badly for the natural and regular supply of business to the office in future. The true test of the success of the scheme will be the amount of the revenue of the office. So long as it is not self-supporting, it cannot be regarded as successful; and the fact that the first year's income does not amount to one-third of the salary of the junior clerk, suggests to our consideration whether such an establishment should be maintained at the expense of the general tax-payer for the benefit of landowners who ought certainly to pay their own conveyancers, and who, moreover, thanklessly refuse to avail themselves of what is thus provided for them by the public exchequer.

Mr. RUDOLPH, the unhappy holder of 500 shares in the Inns of Court Hotel Company, has not, it appears, yet succeeded in getting rid of his liability, although very willing and anxious to sell them to the company, or some of its directors, for a nominal consideration. He has already stood the brunt of battle, and succeeded in open court in substantiating a transfer to a person whom the directors insinuate to be a pauper. The decision of Mr. Justice Mellor, when the rule was argued before him, was in favour of Mr. Rudolph, when we hoped, for the credit of the profession, we should hear no more on the subject. We regret, however, that the company—which affects to be peculiarly connected with the lawyers, or rather the directors, acting on its behalf—are not content with inflicting a loss of £500 and the costs of these law proceedings, but, having obtained the decision of the judge against them upon the merits, they now raise some wretched quibbles of a technical character about the transfer not being properly stamped, and being otherwise "informal upon the face of it." Objections of this character are never taken by respectable practitioners except where they are well justified by the merits of the case, and as a final resort for the purpose of defeating injustice; but here is a man whose only fault is his credulity, and whose misfortune it was to rely upon the representations of this company and its directors. He is willing to pay the penalty of at least

£500 for his folly, and the entire benefit of this large mulct would pass to the company itself; so that if there be the least ground for the statements which are now put forward as to its hopeful condition, the directors must be considered as being well off in obtaining £500 so easily. Yet they insist upon dragging this gentleman from court to chambers, and from chambers to court, in the hope of fastening upon him further liability. If we are not misinformed, the greater number of the directors themselves do not hold more than twenty shares each, and the entire board does not hold half as many as unhappy Mr. Rudolph. This circumstance of itself ought to make them a little more moderate and considerate, but it seems to have quite the opposite effect. Even as a mere matter of policy, it is very doubtful whether it is worth while proclaiming to the world that no member of the board of directors will himself take a transfer of the shares at so heavy a discount. If none of them have sufficient faith in the concern to do this, it becomes a question whether they ought to go on with it, and whether the best course would not be to divide amongst the shareholders whatever remains after paying preliminary expenses. At the extraordinary general meeting which was held in the early part of this month, and at which—although it was reported that "there was a numerous attendance of shareholders," we believe the number was only sixteen or thereabouts, including the directors and their friends,—it was stated that the expenses incurred in the formation of the company would not exceed £1,400. This, of course, does not include the increased price or bonus paid to the persons who originally purchased the property for the purpose of getting up the company, and has probably been mainly expended in advertisements, the rent of an office, and the salary of a secretary. As it amounts to nearly one-half of the sum total received for deposits upon application for shares or for allotments, it cannot be regarded as inconsiderable; but, measuring the expenditure by the statements in the report, there is no doubt that the company would now be a considerable gainer by Mr. Rudolph's transfer if it wound itself up and divided the residue of its funds, after paying its preliminary expenses. Under these circumstances, it seems to be unreasonable and harsh, even if it were sanctioned by law, to force further contributions from him towards carrying out a scheme which he repudiates, and which he alleges he would never have had anything to do with had he originally known the truth about it. Not content, however, with the decision of Mr. Justice Mellor upon Mr. Rudolph's application for a mandamus to compel them to register, the directors have, in their return to the mandamus, set forth several objections to the validity of the transfer—including those technical ones to which we have already referred—and the case having recently come before Mr. Justice Keating on a summons, it was ordered to stand over for argument next term before the full Court, when no doubt we shall hear a good deal more from Mr. Hawkins about "Lawyers' Companies," and the misfortune of those who have anything to do with them. Meanwhile let us protest against this so-called Inns of Court Hotel Company being deemed to be a lawyers' scheme. It came out in some former case in which the company was concerned that its promoter was an "accountant," and no doubt it owes its origin solely to the profit which was to be realised upon the resale to the company by the individuals who were interested in the original purchase of the premises. The fact that there is a sprinkling of country solicitors among its shareholders is easily accounted for by the circular offering them a commission of 2s. 6d. per share, "equally with brokers, on all shares procured by them to be taken in this company,"—after a board had resolved "that sufficient capital had been subscribed to carry out the undertaking." It was natural that such an appeal should produce some responses. There would probably have been the same

result if the circular had been addressed to auctioneers or insurance agents. No doubt some of those who took advantage of this commission (being at the rate of twenty-five per cent. on the deposit, and two and a-half per cent. on the entire nominal capital of the company) are now sorry enough for it, and would be glad to follow Mr. Rudolph's example if they were not terrified by the ordeal through which he has been made to pass. It is, therefore, unfair to stigmatise the general body of lawyers on account of the doings of a company with which as a body they have nothing to do, and which from the first has been repudiated by the journal that represents their interests and wishes. We must ask Mr. Hawkins to bear this in mind when he next has to do with this case. If Mr. Hawkins had taken the trouble to inform himself of the history and true character of the company, he would not have visited the lawyers with the odium of "concocting artful tricks" for ensnaring shareholders, or spoken of the company as being constituted of "a number of lawyers, who with unlimited assurance got up a limited company." This company is no more a lawyers' company than any other company which happens to have some lawyers among its promoters or directors, and therefore we again protest against his assuming it to be identified with the legal profession. At the same time, we fear that it will be impossible for the profession to avoid altogether the disrepute attending proceedings such as those in Mr. Rudolph's case.

"THE PRESS AND THE BENCH" is the subject of an article in the last number of the *Saturday Review*. It is suggested by the recent attacks of some metropolitan newspapers on Vice-Chancellor Stuart, in reference to Lord Vernon's case. The following extracts will be interesting to our readers:—

The anxious care with which the press of this country has, in modern times, avoided everything calculated to bring the administration of justice into contempt is one of the most creditable features of English journalism. Judicial misconduct, when it occurs, is undoubtedly a proper subject for grave comment on the part of the press; but no newspaper is justified in flinging accusations at the Bench, without first ascertaining beyond a doubt that there is some foundation for them. This elementary canon of journalism has been lately violated by one of our contemporaries, who has poured forth a torrent of invective against one of the Vice-Chancellors, in a tone which would, to say no more, have been in the worst possible taste even if the decision complained of had been open to criticism. Unfortunately, however, for the newspaper, it did so happen that the course taken by Vice-Chancellor Stuart was not only right in itself, but so absolutely prescribed by the immemorial practice of the Court as to leave a judge without any option in the matter.

Immediately on the opening of the case, it was suggested on the part of Lord Vernon, and insisted on by the counsel for his infant daughters, that the hearing should be in private, lest the future well-being of the children should be compromised by the disclosures to which the litigation threatened to lead. On the part of the Countess, this demand was not very cheerfully acquiesced in, but it would seem that a kind of reluctant assent was given. Such consent, however, was wholly immaterial, it having been the invariable practice of the Court of Chancery, from which the Vice-Chancellor had no authority to depart, always to hear a case in private if desired on the part of infants, wards of court, who might be compromised by a public discussion. That the rule has saved many innocent girls from scandals which would have ruined their hopes in life will be generally thought a sufficient vindication of its wisdom; but whether the rule be right or wrong, it is the settled practice of the Court of Chancery, and Vice-Chancellor Stuart, in directing the hearing to be in private, was merely granting a request which he had no power to refuse.

In utter ignorance of the real nature of the proceeding the *Daily Telegraph*, after dragging before the public as much of the story as it could pick up, proceeded to denounce what it called "the first attempt at a new system of private investigation," and more than insinuated that the private hearing was a privilege conceded to the station of Lord Vernon by "the mistaken partiality of a Court of Justice." A charge more ridiculously unfounded could scarcely have been made. So far from

an unusual privilege having been conceded to Lord Vernon, the concession, if it could be so called, was made to wards of the Court, who, in accordance with invariable practice, could claim it, and did claim it, as a right. But apart from this, the absurdity of selecting Sir John Stuart as the man to be charged with a want of honour and high feeling makes the libel almost too comical for serious rebuke. We may expect soon to be regaled with an article denouncing Lord Palmerston for his notorious dulness, or charging Lord Shaftesbury with excessive affection for the Pope.

The general concurrence of all the leading and respectable journals in repudiating the course taken by the *Daily Telegraph* must be highly satisfactory to the Vice-Chancellor, as it is to the legal profession.

THE TOMATO CASE—so well known in the sporting world—has come before Mr. O'Malley, Q.C., by way of appeal from Tattersall's. The following is the first judgment delivered by him:—

Assuming that the disputed bets on Tomato were referred by proper authority to the committee of Tattersall's, either as the established tribunal for the settling of such disputes, or by the consent of the parties interested in the particular case, and also assuming that there is no recognized custom to justify the course adopted by Admiral Rous, I am of opinion that the committee had no right to delegate to others, who were not members of its body, the decision of a question which was submitted to itself.

Although it might be open to the committee to call in the counsel of others, and to adopt their views as the ground of its own decision, there does not appear to have been any such adoption in this case; and the decision seems to have proceeded on the authority of Messrs. Sturt and Onslow alone. I am of opinion, therefore, that the decision ought not to be considered binding, and that the committee is bound to decide for itself.

I have, however, assumed the absence of any custom to warrant the course taken by Admiral Rous in calling in the assistance of Messrs. Sturt and Onslow, and that the committee did not adopt their views and pronounce an opinion in accordance with it; but if I be mistaken in these respects—if it be the custom to adopt such a course where the members of the committee are themselves interested, and the committee acted in conformity with that custom, and adopted the decision as its own—I should say that in a case like this, where the obligation is honorary, and the object is to afford a safe guide for men of honour upon a doubtful question, the decision ought to be upheld.

The committee being unable to gather from this judgment whether the Tomato case ought or ought not to be re-opened, or the original award stand good, applied to Mr. O'Malley for a definite answer on this point, to which Mr. O'Malley replied that he was of opinion the original award should not stand good.

SIR CRESSWELL CRESSWELL met with a very severe accident on Friday, the 17th inst. It appears that as he was riding homewards, about six o'clock, up Constitution-hill, the axle-tree of Lord Aveland's carriage, which was being driven up the hill, suddenly broke, and the horses becoming unmanageable, rushed forward, dragging after them the fore part of the vehicle, and struck Sir Cresswell Cresswell, who was riding in front of the carriage, with such force as to knock his horse completely over. He was picked up by Sir Thomas Fremantle, who was passing at the time, and conveyed at his own desire to St. George's Hospital, where his injuries were attended to. He was afterwards removed to his residence at Prince's-gate, Hyde-park. The accident is of a serious character, the knee-cap being severed and broken; and though the learned judge is progressing as favourably as the nature of the injury will permit, it is feared that it will be some time before his Lordship recovers from it. The remainder of the causes standing for hearing in the Divorce Court have, in consequence of this lamentable accident, been postponed till Michaelmas Term; but the Judge of the Court of Admiralty will sit for Sir Cresswell Cresswell in chambers on the 31st inst. at eleven o'clock, to hear summonses, and at twelve o'clock on the same day in court, to hear motions.

THE MEMORANDUM of the Lord Chief Justice on transportation will be read with interest even by those who differ most widely from the views of his Lordship on that difficult question. From the extracts from Sir R. Mayne's evidence, given by the Lord Chief Justice, we learn that a ticket of leave is tantamount to an authoritative certificate of good character, and protects its bearer from the scrutiny to which, if he belonged to the unconvicted portion of the population, he might be subjected. The great increase of assaults of an aggravated nature which of late years has taken place throughout the kingdom, especially in London, led to the issue of a Royal commission to inquire into the whole system of our secondary punishments and prison discipline. It was the general impression that the too liberal issue of tickets of leave was the chief cause of the frequent occurrence of garotting—the audacity with which these crimes were perpetrated leading to the inference that they were the doings of persons who had no great reverence for the law. Strangely enough, it is stated in the report that this increase of crime corresponds in point of time to the discharge of the convicts who were first sentenced under the Act of 1857. The necessity of a thorough inquiry into our system of secondary punishments has thus been almost strictly demonstrated. Indeed, the Legislature anticipated the conclusions of the commissioners by passing, last session, an Act for the purpose of increasing the severity of this class of punishments. But as this remedy is manifestly inadequate, the report of the commissioners is certain to lead to further legislation on the subject. The report fills 73 pages, and has been subscribed by all the commissioners except the Lord Chief Justice, Lord Naas, and Mr. Henley. The inquiries of the commissioners chiefly related to the operation of the two statutes 16 & 17 Vict. c. 99, and the amending Act 20 & 21 Vict. c. 3. The leniency of these statutes towards criminals had had a counterpart in the mildness of judicial sentences for the last thirty years, and thus seems to have followed in the wake of public opinion rather than to have been in advance of it. On the Western Circuit it has been ascertained that the average length of sentences during the last five years is only one-third of what it was in the period from 1838 to 1842. There has been an almost equal diminution of severity at the Central Criminal Court. This relaxation is attributed by the report partly to the statutes referred to. We are rather disposed to attribute the mildness of our criminal code and of our judges to a modification of public sentiment. The report recommends that the *minimum* term of penal servitude should be increased—that a distinction should be taken between the predatory class and accidental criminals—that the system of transportation be extended—that sentences of penal servitude should not be for less than seven years—that the reconvicted should receive proportionably severe punishment—and that a remission of a portion of the sentence may still be obtained by a deserving convict, but that he be afterwards subjected to a close supervision. It appears that there were 285 ticket-of-leave men reconvicted in 1862, and that there are still 2,297 loose upon society. The Lord Chief Justice is of opinion that no supervision of convicts at large in the United Kingdom can be of any use. He approves, however, of a partial remission of the sentence after the convict has been transported, and of a more extended system of transportation. In support of his views respecting the remission of a sentence in the case of convicts detained in the United Kingdom, he adduces the governor of the prison at Edinburgh, who says that he has found only two instances where prisoners dreaded coming back to penal servitude. The principal value of punishment no doubt consists, as is observed by his Lordship, in its effect in deterring from crime; but many persons doubt whether its efficacy must be in proportion to its severity. In fact, it was the excessive severity of our criminal code that led to the undue humanity of our judges in administering it. The

report of the commissioners and memorandum of the Lord Chief Justice exhaust this question, and will well repay an attentive perusal. We should take care, that in giving up the use of scorpions we do not rush into the opposite extreme of the unnecessary paternal regard we have so long evinced towards convicts. The humanitarian schemes of the past ten years proceed upon the notion that society exists for the special benefit of its enemies. It is full time to remember that the punishment of crime is one of the prime necessities of every community, and that the reformation of criminals is a duty of a very secondary and distinct character.

THE COST OF CIVIC JUSTICE has been shown by some recent returns. It appears that judiciary fees produced £11,387, and that the total cost of the administration of justice was £487,448. The items were as follows:—Magistracy, £74,296; alteration of justice room at Guildhall, £871; police, £118,458; Newgate gaol, £53,488; for ordinary management, £25,646; for alterations and improvements, House of Correction, Giltspur-street, £1,373; City Prison, Holloway, £80,212; and an extra item for furniture of £522; Debtors' Prison, £55,066; and extraordinary outlay of £6,377; miscellaneous prison expenses amounted to £6,529. The administration of justice at the Sessions-house cost £89,258; alterations and improvements of the Sessions-house, £7,500. Lastly, in this category there is an entry of £9,467, the cost of the office of the coroner. To the amount of judiciary fees quoted above must be added the reimbursement on account of prisons, £17,555, and the same on account of criminal prosecutions, £8,456, making a total of £37,398 as a contribution towards the total of £487,448 incurred on account of the administration of justice.

THE BOARD OF TRADE has recently been asked to obtain the immediate enactment of a measure of a very simple description, but of great public commercial importance. British and foreign manufacturers have been encouraged, under Government auspices, and through our diplomatic and consular agents abroad, to exhibit at the Exhibitions of 1851 and 1862, in the hope of obtaining the prize medals and honourable mentions which were the sole advantages that could be offered them for the trouble and expense they incurred. In several instances unscrupulous manufacturers who obtained no prize medal or honourable mention have placed on their trade circulars, or on the articles in which they deal, representations of the medals and false statements that honourable mention has been made of them. In a recent case it was decided by the Court of Chancery that there is no power to restrain this dishonesty, as no private individual right is infringed by it, and no one of the real medal-holders could show that a fraud was committed personally on himself. To meet the evil, it is consequently proposed to pass a short Act to declare that the false assumption of the medal or of honourable mention shall be a misdemeanor, punishable by a small fine only for a first offence, without proof of intent to defraud (the necessity for which would make the measure practically inoperative), and to place the unauthorised imitation of the signature of another manufacturer on the same footing. The bill is promoted by a committee of medal-holders, and supported by the Mercantile Law Amendment Society; and it is to be hoped, for the credit of the country and the safety of all trading interests, that it may be possible to pass it during the present session.

AS THE PERIOD ANNUALLY ALLOTTED to the temporary extinction—not always the annihilation—of the innocent legislative *bonbons* that have been accumulating during the session, it comes within our province to record their gradual disappearance from the arena of the House of Commons. Lord Chelmsford's Navy Prize Agents' Bill appears likely to survive the onslaught. The measure is intended to empower every

ship of war, when put into commission, to appoint a standing prize agent who is to be remunerated to the extent of 2½ per cent. on the value of the prizes to be taken. The Bill is intended to deprive the Board of Admiralty of their present powers of appraising and selling prize vessels. The only objection we see to the bill is, that it is a very trifling and partial instalment of a reform in a branch of procedure, no defect of which ought to be left unprovided for, since any injustice to the parties interested in a question of prize of war might lead to a difficulty with a neutral or even friendly foreign power. International law being in a most unsettled state, it is the least that the administrative machinery of our Courts of Admiralty should be tolerably satisfactory. As Lord Chelmsford, owing to his early vocation, may be expected to take an interest in the legal relations of our military marine, we should gladly see him devote further attention to the consideration of the numerous vexed questions now daily occurring by reason of the American war, and confer upon that branch of the service to which he devoted his early youth some of the fruits of his Lordship's industry and brilliant legal career.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF A PUBLIC OFFICER, and even of a private employer, for the negligent acts of those employed by him, is a doctrine of our law to which, except in a few cases, such as the Factory Act, there is not any exception. But, in addition to their liabilities in this respect at common law, the duties of most of our public officers are defined by statute. We are disposed to think that this principle admits of being extended even to the criminal acts of persons acting under the authority of any public officer. So thoroughly, however, is the rule referred to recognised by our law in the case of sheriffs, that where the duties of the bailiffs are improperly discharged, the sheriff, and not the under-sheriff, is liable, *Cameron v. Reynolds*, Cowp. 403. The sheriff being thus responsible for the official misdemeanours of these bailiffs, they are, consequently, bound in an obligation with sureties for the due execution of their office. It follows from all this that a sheriff should take care that his bailiffs are reputable persons, who will not be tempted to do any illegal or irreparable injury to those against whom they act. That sheriffs of Northumberland have not been always sufficiently attentive to the character of their underlings is made tolerably patent by the facts of Mr. Bewicke's case, as lately disclosed by Mr. H. Berkeley in the House of Commons. It appears from his statement that Mr. Bewicke was a gentleman who had been defeated in an action at law, on whose property the sheriff then proceeded to levy. The bailiffs employed by him, however, were a species of bandits. One of them had been repeatedly, during the preceding twenty years, convicted before the local magistrates; another was connected with poachers, and had been sentenced to seven years' transportation for perjury, from which he got released by a ticket of leave. The third sheriff's officer had been convicted of several assaults, of poaching, stealing, and robbery. Another of them was a notorious drunkard. The last of the number was the most expert poacher in the county. Their leader produced a brace of pistols before Mr. Bewicke, who then went for a revolver; but there the matter so far ended. The next day he fired a pistol out of the window, in order to clean it, after having first ascertained from the bailiffs themselves that they were out of the way. These then applied for a warrant, and finally had Mr. Bewicke convicted on an indictment for an attempt to murder, and sentenced to penal servitude for four years. Afterwards, the witnesses against him were convicted of perjury on the material point, and he was released. Surely a release and a return to him of part of the proceeds of his property sold as forfeited under the sentence are no compensation to Mr. Bewicke for the gross injury done

him. A reference to "Stephen's Commentaries," vol. 2, p. 654, 5th ed., will show that it is the legal duty of a sheriff to have at least one suitable person at the head of all companies of bailiffs, in order to see that the bounds of propriety be not overstepped. This is a duty of sheriffs which we think is indicated more frequently by the unpleasant consequences of its breach than by its observance.

IN THE RECENT DEBATE ON THE FISHERIES' (IRELAND) BILL, in the House of Lords, the Lord Chancellor made an observation which is worth recording with respect to the right of Parliament to alter any of its own previous enactments. In reference to the too frequent exercise of such a right, his Lordship observed, "a more revolutionary doctrine, a more wicked doctrine, had never been enunciated. The title to the Crown of this country was an Act of Parliament; the titles to the estates possessed by their lordships were based upon Acts of Parliament; and if their lordships countenanced such a doctrine, they would weaken the title to everything that was most valuable in the institutions of the country." The question before their lordships was the expediency of abolishing certain privileges granted to Irish proprietors by the Irish Fisheries' Act of 1842. We refer to his Lordship's most sensible observation rather for its applicability to the numerous unnecessary changes in the law that are so frequently mooted and carried into effect, than on account of its relevancy to the section of the Act then under discussion. On the law of judgments alone we have had in the present reign about ten statutes passed for England and Ireland. As to fisheries and game, there are about forty statutes at present relating to this description of property. We think that a search into the matter would show that not a single year passes without at least one new measure being introduced to protect our birds, beasts, or fishes from the unwary intrusion of marauders. The game and fishery laws, no doubt, relate to important interests; but we cannot see why they could not be comprised in a single consolidating enactment for the whole United Kingdom.

THE QUESTION OF IRISH JUDICIAL STATISTICS was brought before the House of Lords a few evenings ago by the Marquis of Clanricarde, who succeeded in having a resolution passed to the effect that "a department for the collection of judicial statistics should be formed in connection with the Home Office." England and Wales have, as our readers are aware, had the benefit of an annual issue of judicial statistics since 1858. The present Government gave a pledge in 1861, in a debate on the matter, that the scheme for collecting these statistics should be extended to Ireland, and it appears that the design has been in course of being carried out, but that a delay was occasioned by a desire on the part of the Irish executive to obtain still more perfect tables than those used in England. *Dimidium facti qui caput habet*. Let them commence—*rusticus expectat*—and it will be the more easy to realise an approximately perfect scheme. We hope that no time will be lost in procuring these returns from Ireland.

THE NEW VOLUNTEERS' ACT, to consolidate and amend the law relating to the Volunteer force in Great Britain, which received the Royal assent on Tuesday, has been printed. It contains fifty-three sections, and a schedule of forms to be used, and also showing the enactments now repealed. The Act is divided into seven parts. Her Majesty is empowered to accept the service of volunteer corps through the lieutenants of counties, and to form a permanent staff. The acceptance of a commission in a volunteer corps by a member of the House of Commons is not to render his seat vacant. A volunteer may quit his corps, when not in actual military service, on complying with certain conditions set forth. The general command may be placed under a field or general officer, and an annual inspection is to take place. The Secretary of State may make regula-

ions for the government of the force, and in case of invasion the Crown may call on the volunteers for active military service and grant them an allowance. There are other provisions in the statute respecting discipline and the power to acquire land for drill and practice. The Chief Commissioner of Works may allot a portion of the Royal parks for shooting practice. The law in regard to volunteers is now consolidated and amended.

THE COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE BILL LEGISLATION, which has recently made its report, recommends that an Act of Parliament should be passed enabling persons to do certain things without coming to Parliament for a special bill. This is certainly a description of legislation by wholesale, which we have no desire to see carried into effect. The true course of the evils intended to be remedied by the committee are to be found in the unsatisfactory and most anomalous condition of our machinery of legislation. Until there shall be a special department appointed to prepare all legislative bills, there is no likelihood that these will be presented to the House even in such a chrysalis state as that they may be expected to be, after any amount of discussion and change, a creditable addition to the statute-book.

A NOTICE for the Surrey Assizes, relating to the entry of causes, has been issued by order of the judges of assize. It will be found in our number of to-day, under the head of Assizes.

THE ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE will be closed from and after Tuesday, the 18th of August next, to Wednesday, the 28th of October next, inclusive.

THE SESSION.

The session of Parliament which is just drawing to a close has not produced much that has any special interest for lawyers, if we except the Statute Law Revision Bill, of which the interest is of rather a negative character, although its great importance and value are unquestionable, notwithstanding the depreciatory observations of Mr. Hennessey and Mr. Ayrton, when the bill was before the House of Commons on Wednesday evening. The only measures directed expressly at the lawyers were Mr. Bouverie's Writs Prohibition Bill and Lord Brougham's Courts of Conciliation Bill, and these have had the reception which they merited. It is not unlikely, however, that both will be again brought before Parliament next session. In that case, it will be necessary to enlighten our legislators once more upon their respective peculiar features, and to adopt the same means for protecting the profession from these insidious attacks as were recently found so effective.

The real work of next session—so far as solicitors and attorneys are concerned—will be an agitation for the repeal of the obnoxious certificate tax. Enough has been done this year to prepare the House of Commons for a vigorous attempt next year to obtain the total repeal of this impost. There have been petitions on the subject from England, Ireland, and Scotland—some of them very numerously signed. One, signed exclusively by English solicitors, and forwarded through this journal, bore the signatures of 232 solicitors and firms of solicitors. Another, also presented through the agency of the *Solicitors' Journal*, was signed by 150 Irish solicitors and firms. The council of the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association, representing a large constituency throughout the provinces as well as in the metropolis, lent its aid in the shape of a petition, which, containing as it did an able summary of the arguments against the tax, may be usefully adopted on future occasions. All these efforts will not be without their result, although no one expected any immediate effect. The reduction of the tax ten years ago was obtained only after a persistent agitation of the question for three or four sessions. It is not likely that its total repeal can be gained upon easier terms. If it is worth having, it is worth fighting for; and unless solicitors are prepared to do battle for it,

they may save themselves any further trouble about it. From the numerous communications which we have received on the subject, we have no doubt that a very large proportion of the attorneys and solicitors of the three kingdoms feel the annual certificate duty to be an oppressive and unfair burden; but there is a notion abroad that it is almost hopeless to expect its complete removal. Various causes have contributed to the prevalence of this notion, not the least of them being the well-known reluctance which every Chancellor of the Exchequer feels towards every project for diminishing the revenue. We have, however, already shown how any deficit produced by the abolition of the annual duty might be almost entirely made good by a wholesome increase in the charge upon admission into the profession of an attorney, and by a corresponding increase upon a stamp payable upon a call to the Bar. A measure of this kind would not only recoup the public exchequer, but would have a salutary effect in checking the too great immigration which of late years has set in towards the legal profession. We have little doubt that Mr. Gladstone will see no insuperable difficulty, but rather some great advantages, in such a measure—so that there is no real cause for discouragement on this ground. Another cause of the feeling of doubtfulness on the subject, which some people indulge in, is the result of the agitation ten years ago. They cannot help thinking that what was then done was something like a compromise binding upon the present generation, or at all events that the Government regard it in this light. We are able to say upon a careful perusal of the accounts of what took place in Parliament at and for some sessions before the passing of the Act of 1853, that there is no foundation whatever for such a statement. There was then, in truth, a strong probability of the attorneys and solicitors obtaining a total repeal of the annual tax; and it was only by a kind of legerdemain, and to the great surprise of the profession, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer brought in a measure for its reduction, accompanied by other reductions that were of no benefit whatever, but rather a disadvantage to the profession. The whole question is, therefore, free from any such considerations, and it only requires unity and energy on the part of the solicitors to obtain an object which the great majority of them very much desire, and a considerable number regard as of serious importance. If before next session an influential committee, who will really put their shoulders to the wheel, can be got together to devise a plan of action for the United Kingdom, there need be little doubt about the result. What has been already done this year shows that there are throughout the country, and also in Scotland and Ireland, a large number of solicitors who are willing to work in the cause. All that is wanted is some centre of action, and this, of course, ought to be in London. We have received from the provinces the names of several gentlemen who would be willing to act on a committee. All, or nearly all, the leading metropolitan solicitors are so much pressed with business as to make them little inclined for taking an active part in the proceedings of such a body; but there will be little difficulty in obtaining the co-operation of some of them. There should then be no delay in forming an association for the purpose of bringing about the passing of the measure. We do not mean to propose anything like a public organisation, with salaried officers supported by voluntary subscriptions, but merely a large committee of a somewhat representative character, with honorary secretaries who would not grudge bestowing their labour to some extent for the good of their brethren. This journal will promote a movement of this kind with all the means in its power.

During the long vacation we shall call attention in detail to some of the more important Acts of the session, so far as they have any special interest for the lawyers. They are unusually few and unimportant. We have looked through them all up to cap. liv. without finding one that

will require much comment. The only one which makes any notable change in our law is the "Act to amend the law relating to the liability of innkeepers, and to prevent certain frauds upon them." When the bill was before the House of Commons we called attention to its provisions at some length, and showed the nature and effect of the proposed change, so that it will not be necessary for us to add much upon this subject. The "Act for the further security of the persons of her Majesty's subjects from personal violence," is also worthy of notice. It empowers Criminal Courts to sentence garroters to be privately whipped once, twice, or thrice, in addition to the punishment to which they were already liable under former enactments. Acts for the protection of ornamental grounds in cities and boroughs, for the regulation of bakehouses, and for amending the law relating to post-office savings' banks, although not peculiarly interesting to lawyers, are not without social interest, and are important as showing the growing tendency to over-legislation. We have already given an account of Mr. Gladstone's Stock Certificate Act, enabling proprietors of money in the public funds to obtain certificates thereof with coupons annexed payable to bearer. We shall hereafter have some observations to offer upon the provisions of this Act, so far as it may affect trustees.

THE NEW "CLAUSES CONSOLIDATION" BILLS.

CONCLUDING NOTICE.

THE RAILWAYS CLAUSES BILL.

Part I applies to the railway authorised to be constructed by any special Act hereafter passed and incorporating this part. A company may deviate from the line or level of an arch, tunnel, or viaduct within the limits of deviation and subject to sections 11, 12, and 15 of the Railways Clauses Consolidation Act, and may, upon a certificate of the Board of Trade, substitute for an arch, &c., any engineering work not shown on the plans or sections.

The company may not shunt trains to pass any train over a level crossing. The company shall erect and maintain a lodge for the residence of a gatekeeper at a level crossing, and shall abide by the regulations of the Board of Trade as to crossing and the speed: on failure to do so or to keep a proper person to watch and superintend the crossing, the penalty for every offence is to be £20, and £10 for every day it continues. The Board of Trade may require the company to carry the turnpike or carriage road either under or over the railway instead of crossing on a level, or to execute other works. Additional lands may be taken for the work required by the Board of Trade.

In making a communication authorised by the special Act between the railway and any other railway, all interference with the works of the other railway shall be made under the direction of its engineer, and in case of difference a referee is to be appointed by the Board of Trade. The company with whose railway the junction is made may erect such signals and conveniences incident to the junction, and appoint and remove such watchmen and persons as may be necessary to prevent danger or interference at the junction. The same company is to work and manage the signals and conveniences, the other company repaying the expense half-yearly.

In constructing, and after completing, works in or over tidal lands or a tidal water, the company is to keep burning every night such lights as the Board of Trade shall require, under a penalty of £20. In constructing a bridge over a tidal water, when the special Act does not make express provision, the company is to construct it with such headway and waterway, and with such opening spans, and according to such plan, as the Board of Trade directs. At opening spans vessels are not to be detained longer than necessary for a carriage to cross the bridge, and the company shall abide by the regu-

lations of the Board of Trade, under a penalty of £20. Where the railway cuts off access between the land and a tidal water or tidal lands, the company shall, during construction and afterwards, make and maintain for general use, free of toll, such footways and carriage-ways as the Board of Trade directs; but, 1, not for an owner or occupier who has been paid for severance; 2, not so as to interfere with the working of the railway; 3, the expense of a way made after the construction of the railway is to be borne by the person interested. If the way cross on a level, the crossing is to be under the Board of Trade, and if the crossing be made after the construction of the railway, the expense of watching is to be borne by the person interested. Where the railway is authorised to be made skirting tidal lands or a tidal water the company shall not make any deviation in that direction without the consent of the Board of Trade. If a work in or affecting tidal lands or a tidal water is abandoned or allowed to decay, the Board of Trade may repair or abate it. The Board may at any time order a survey of such work.

By part II, where the time limited by any special railway Act, either before or after this Act, is extended by a special Act hereafter passed incorporating this part, in estimating the amount of compensation, regard shall be had to, and compensation be assessed for, the additional damage (if any) sustained by owners, occupiers, or other persons, by reason of the extension. The extension is not to affect any contract or notice by the company, before the extension Act, for purchasing, taking, or using land.

Part III.—Working Agreements. Where a company under a special railway Act, either before or after the passing of this Act, is authorised by a special Act hereafter passed, and incorporating this part, to agree with another company for maintenance and management, using and working, or fixing, collecting, and apportioning the revenue of the railway, such authority or agreement shall not affect the tolls which the companies are authorised to demand from any other person or company. The agreement shall not have any operation unless sanctioned by such votes at a general meeting of each company as prescribed by the special Act; otherwise by three-fifths. Before the company enters into the agreement notice is to be given by advertisement in a form to be approved by the Board of Trade. The agreement must be approved by the Board, which shall be satisfied that it has been sanctioned by the meetings. During the agreement, in computing charges, distances shall be measured along the railways as if they were one, and one short distance only is to be charged. The companies may appoint a joint committee, and delegate their powers to it. At periods of ten years after the agreement the Board of Trade may cause it to be revised in the interests of the public, but the modification if not approved by meetings of the companies, shall not take effect, but at the expiration of twelve months the agreement shall cease.

Part IV.—Steam Vessels. Where a railway company, incorporated either before or after this Act, is authorised by a special Act hereafter passed incorporating this part to use or arrange for using steam vessels, or to take tolls in respect of them, the tolls shall be charged to all persons equally and after the same rate as to passengers in a like vessel between the same places, and no reduction or advance be made in favour of or against any person using the vessels in consequence of his travelling or not travelling on the railway. The Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1854, is to apply to such steam vessels. The company may make, enforce, and shall publish bye-laws respecting the vessels, as with respect to the railway. Tolls and costs and damages to be paid in respect of the vessels may be recovered by distress. Every seventh year after the passing of the special Act, the Board of Trade, being of opinion that the public interests are prejudiced by the steam vessels, may give to the company notice thereof, with reasons,

and if the company does not, before the next session of Parliament, make provision for the public interest, or if the injury is, in the opinion of the Board, incapable of remedy, the Board is to report to both Houses, and after twelve months the company's powers relative to the vessels shall cease.

Part V.—Amalgamation. This part is to apply where two or more railway companies, incorporated either before or after this Act, are amalgamated by a special Act hereafter passed, incorporating this part. Companies are to be deemed amalgamated—1, when two or more are dissolved and the members united into a new one; 2, where on dissolution of a company or companies the undertaking or undertakings is or are transferred to another existing company. The property, powers, and rights of the dissolved company shall, subject to the contracts of that company, become vested in the amalgamated company. The special Acts relating to the dissolved company shall remain in force. Debts from or to, and tolls payable to, and recoverable by, the dissolved company are to be payable by or to, and be recoverable by, the amalgamated company. Deeds, contracts, and securities made before the amalgamation with the dissolved company or its directors, and obligations and liabilities, are to remain in force; also causes and rights of action. Legal proceedings by or against the dissolved company are not to abate; submissions to arbitration are not to be affected by the amalgamating Act; unexecuted works of the dissolved company are to be completed by the amalgamated company; contracts by the dissolved company for the purchase of land shall be carried out; money paid into the bank, or to the trustees, by the dissolved company, or by the amalgamated company, under any special Act relating to the dissolved company, shall be applied pursuant to such Act; officers and persons having at the time of the amalgamation books or effects of the dissolved company shall be liable to the amalgamated company; clerks, officers, and servants shall become clerks, &c., of the amalgamated company; books and documents which would have been evidence for or against the dissolved company shall be admitted for or against the amalgamated company; calls made by the dissolved company shall be payable; registers, address-books, and certificates shall continue to be valid and subsisting; also bye-laws, rules, and regulations. Every thing done before the amalgamation shall be as valid as if the amalgamating Act had not been passed.

Part VI.—Powers of Amalgamation, Sale or Leasing. Where by a special Act hereafter passed and incorporating this part, a prospective authority is given for the union, by any of these modes, of undertakings, the amalgamation, sale or lease, may be carried out by such proportion of votes at a special meeting as mentioned in the bill; but shall not have effect until approved by the Board of Trade. The amount of capital created by amalgamation shall not exceed the capitals of the principal and the amalgamated company, and in sale no addition to the capital of the principal company shall be made beyond the capital of the selling company. The amalgamation, &c., shall be by deed, duly stamped, justly setting forth the terms. The deed shall be deposited at the head office of the principal company, and a copy with the clerk of the peace of every county in which the undertaking lies, to be kept for inspection under the 7 Will. 4, & 1 Vict. The amalgamation, &c., shall not have effect until it has been advertised. The undertaking amalgamated, &c., shall form part of the undertaking of the principal company, and the special Acts, so far as they relate to the undertaking, shall apply. Preference or guaranteed shares or stock of the amalgamating company shall become such of the principal company, with their priorities; and ordinary shares and stock shall become such of the principal company, upon such terms as shall be agreed upon between the company, or the principal company may create new shares or stock in substitution. With respect to shares of the

amalgamating company not paid up, the principal company shall have all the powers and remedies of the amalgamated company. The principal company may, by the creation of new shares or new stock, raise all such money as the amalgamating, selling, or leasing company had power to raise by the creation of shares or stock. The selling company shall be dissolved, except for the purpose of winding up, for which purpose it may dispose of its effects not sold to the principal company, and subject to the liabilities not taken by that company, shall distribute the net money among the shareholders.

Provisions similar to those above noticed respecting a company actually amalgamated by a special Act here follow—that, notwithstanding amalgamation, sale and dissolution or lease, deeds, contracts, and securities shall remain valid; also respecting debts, liabilities, abatement of legal proceedings, moneys paid into the bank, and acts already done.

Part VII.—Abandonment. Where a railway company, incorporated either before or after the passing of this Act, is authorised by a special Act hereafter passed, and incorporating this part, to abandon a railway, the company shall (subject to the provisions of this part) be released from all liability to make, maintain, or work the railway, or to purchase the lands, or (except as after mentioned) to complete the purchase of any lands, or any contract for making or working the railway; but the company is not to be released from liability to complete the purchase of lands where the contract has been in part performed, or a sum been fixed as the consideration. Where the company is relieved by this Act from a contract for the purchase of lands, or from making and working the railway, the company shall make to the owners or occupiers or parties interested, compensation for non-completion. Where the railway has been wholly or partially made, the company shall make compensation for damage by omission of accommodation works. If the company would be liable to repair a bridge or arch carrying a road across the railway, the company, with the Board of Trade's permission, may remove the bridge or arch and restore the road. All lands acquired by the company shall be sold according to the provisions of the Lands Clauses Act with respect to lands not required, and the offer to be made accordingly to sell the lands to the person from whose lands they were severed shall be made at a price not greater than the company's purchase-money.

THE WATERWORKS CLAUSES BILL.

The Act is to apply to waterworks to which any special Act hereafter passed and incorporated with this Act relates. Power is given to justices to inquire as to the danger of a reservoir, and where the danger is imminent to order works, or where it is not imminent to summon the undertakers and make order on a hearing. The undertakers may appeal to the sessions in like manner as under the Railways Clauses Act, 1845. They are not to be liable in damages for any diminution or cessation of the water supply occasioned by the execution of the order.

A supply for domestic purposes is not to include a supply for cattle, or for horses or washing carriages where the horses or carriages are kept for sale or hire or by a carrier, or a supply for any trade, manufacture or business, or for gardens, fountains or any ornamental purpose. The undertakers shall not be liable, under any agreement for the supply of water for other than domestic purposes, to any damages for a want of supply through frost, drought, or other unavoidable accident. When authorised to supply water by measure, the undertakers may let water meters for hire, and their officers may enter for inspection of meters. Power is given to cut off the pipes upon contravention of the special Act; and waste, misuse, or contamination made liable to a penalty of £5. A person using water for any purpose other than that for which it is supplied is

to be liable to a penalty of 40s., and a person wrongfully taking water, to a penalty of £5.

A Bill has also passed for an Act to regulate the exercise of powers under special Acts for the construction and maintenance of telegraphs.

REAL PROPERTY AND CONVEYANCING.

Correspondence.

EXECUTION OF DEEDS BY A PARTY IN DIFFERENT CHARACTERS.

Will some of your readers favour me with an opinion on the following point of practice:—

Two brothers and a sister, A., B., and C., are the owners of an estate. C's share was, on her marriage, conveyed to trustees on the usual trusts. One of the trustees is her brother B. A. makes a will and appoints B. as one of the executors thereof. After the death of A. and C. it is agreed to sell the estate, which is done in several lots, and B. is of course made a party to the conveyances—first, in respect of his own third share; second, with the other trustee in respect of A.'s third share; and third, with the other trustee in respect of C.'s third share.

Should B. sign three times in his three capacities? or would one signature suffice? I can find no case in point whatever.

In 1 Jur. 181, under the head of "Practical Remarks on Deeds," I find the following:—

Sometimes a person is a party in two characters, for instance as executor to one and heir to another. Where this is the case, it is usual to make him a party in as many parts as he has distinct characters; but there is nothing said as to the manner of execution. A reply in time for your impression of the 1st of August will oblige.

LEOULEIUS.

Bradford-on-Avon, July 20th.

COMMON LAW.

BILL OF SALE—MISTAKE.

Biddulph v. Gould, Q.B., 11 W. R. 882.

There are numerous cases establishing the rule that where either a statute or a rule of common law requires that a particular matter is to be evidenced by deed, all the essential elements of the transaction must be mentioned in the instrument prior to its execution. If the document be sealed and delivered with any blank left not filled up, it is invalid, and will not, except in certain special cases of fraud, operate even by estoppel, any action founded on it being open to the plea *non est factum*. But if the deed be once perfect, any subsequent change in the situation of the parties will not affect any portion of the contract or debt to which it relates, that continues unperformed or unsatisfied. If a bond, for instance, be given to secure the repayment of a loan of £1,000, a payment of £900 does not extinguish the bond as regards the remaining £100. This rule, though unquestioned when stated in a simple form, is nevertheless open to some difficulties when the circumstances become more complicated. In the present case a bill of sale was drawn up for a certain sum, of which part was paid before the final execution of the bill of sale. But in order to save expense, the parties executed the bill for the larger amount, with the clear understanding that it was to stand as a security only for the sum actually due. There being no fraud in the transaction, the Court of Queen's Bench held that the claim of the plaintiff under the bill of sale was prior to that of his debtor's assignees in bankruptcy. Notwithstanding the numerous technical rules to which an assignment even of personal property must conform, nevertheless a really *bona fide* transaction will, we think, be found, as a general rule, able to stand the test of a multitude of theoretical objections. But if, on the contrary, there be fraud or gross negligence in question, it will often be found sufficient to neutralise a technical plea that otherwise should be held good. If, for instance, A. give printed or sealed forms of transfer of shares in blank to B., who fraudulently fills up the blanks, A.'s negligence may amount to an estoppel as against a

transferee for value (*Taylor v. Great Indian Peninsular Company*, 28 L. J. Ch. 289); and this is so notwithstanding the rule of law that a deed cannot be altered in a material part after its execution (Com. Dig. Fait, F. 1). In the present case the bill of sale, being erroneous, was not made better in this respect by registration. Nevertheless, the error being free from fraud, was held not to invalidate the registration under the 17 & 18 Vict. c. 36. The error, it will be observed, could not mislead creditors to their prejudice, for it actually understated the extent of the plaintiff's solvency by overstating the amount of his liability under the bill of sale. Honesty, in point of law, like charity in religion, is thus usually found to cover a multitude of defects.

NOTICE OF ACTION—MEANING OF A CALENDAR MONTH.—In calculating a calendar month, if the computation commence during the course of a month, the right method is to proceed from a given day in one month to the day with the corresponding number in the ensuing.

In a case where one calendar month's notice of action at least was necessary, notice was given on the 28th of April, and the action was commenced on the 29th of May.

Held, that the action was rightly commenced.—*Freeman v. Read*, Q. B., 11 W. R. 802.

COSTS—ARBITRATION—DAMAGES UNDER FORTY SHILLINGS.—An action of defamation was by consent of the parties referred to two arbitrators, and the costs of the cause were by the agreement of reference to abide the event, and the costs of the reference were to be in the discretion of the arbitrators. The arbitrators found one of the issues in favour of the plaintiff with twenty shillings damages, and the other issues in favour of the defendant, and directed the defendant to pay all the costs of the reference, and the costs were taxed.

On a motion to review the Master's taxation, the Court refused the rule.—*Frean v. Sargent*, Ex., 11 W. R. 808.

SUMMER ASSIZES.

HOME CIRCUIT.

SURREY.

NOTICE—ENTRY OF CAUSES.

The following notice has just been issued by order of the judges:—

Causes can be entered provisionally at the office of the clerk of assize for the Home Circuit in London, on Monday, the 27th of July, and daily thereafter until Saturday, the 1st of August, inclusive, between the hours of ten and two.

They will be formally entered and put on the list at Croydon, by the clerk of assize, in the order of their provisional entry, and before causes entered at Croydon.

In case any record entered in London be withdrawn before the opening of the commission at Croydon, the entry fee will be returned.

A list of causes for trial each day will be sent to London in the evening of the previous day, and will be affixed outside the Porter's-lodge, Serjeant's-inn, Chancery-lane, and also outside the office of Mr. Abbott, the under sheriff, No. 8, New-inn, Strand, as soon as possible after the list can be arranged.

The first day's list will not extend beyond No. 20 in the list of causes provisionally entered, should there be so many. The list of causes provisionally entered may be seen at the London office of the clerk of assize.

This arrangement may not apply to future assizes.

LEWES.

July 20.—The commission was opened in this town to-day by Mr. Baron Bramwell. There were eleven causes entered for trial, five of which were marked for special juries.

MIDLAND CIRCUIT.

LEICESTER.

July 15.—The commission was opened in this town to-day by Mr. Serjeant Hayes, Mr. Justice Williams having been detained at Northampton. Seven causes were entered for trial, three of which were marked for special juries.

NOTTINGHAM.

July 20.—The commission was opened in this town to-day by Mr. Justice Williams. The cause list was light.

NORFOLK CIRCUIT. JAMES ATLESBURY.

July 15.—The commission was opened in this town to-day by the Lord Chief Baron. There were only four causes entered for trial, all of which were marked for special juries.

BEDFORD.

CROWN COURT.—(Before Mr. Justice WIGHTMAN.)

July 21.—Robert Jordan, 21, and William Craddock, 33, were arraigned on and pleaded "Not Guilty" to the charge of wilful murder of Frederick Budd, in the town of Bedford, on the 10th of May, 1863; and from the position of the parties and the peculiar circumstances of the case it excited the greatest interest, the court and every avenue to it being crowded during the trial.

The history of this melancholy event is a short one. It appeared that the deceased gentleman, Mr. Budd, who was a solicitor practising in Buckingham, was staying with his wife on a visit in Bedford, and on the night of the day in question (Sunday, the 10th of May), about 11 p.m., as they were both returning from St. Paul's-square to their residence, in passing through a lane which appears to have offered a short cut to their abode, and is called Castle-lane, they came upon a group of five men standing across the road close to the gates of Mr. Higgins's brewery, two of whom were the prisoners, and the other three were men who were called by the prosecution as witnesses to what happened. On arriving at this spot, it seems that the prisoner Craddock staggered up against Mr. Budd, who turned round and asked him what he meant, when, without a word, Craddock struck him a violent blow on the face, and then said "That's what I mean," and then the other prisoner coming up they both set on him, and with heavy blows on head and face, knocked him down, and while he was on the ground, according to the evidence of his wife, who was close to him, in spite of his appeal for help, they struck him repeatedly with their fists on his face, leaving him senseless, and went off towards the High-street, the other three men, who were looking on, rendering no help, either at the time of the assault or afterwards. Mrs. Budd remained alone by her husband, endeavouring to raise him from the ground, but was unable to obtain any help until a young man, a civilian, came up and assisted her to lead him along the street, and then, as they were walking along, according to the lady's evidence and that of the man who was helping her to support her husband, Craddock came up to them and said that Mr. Budd was drunk and unable to take care of himself, asking, at the same time, how he liked to have his nose flat to his face. Shortly after this some of the militiamen who were billeted in the town, and were returning home, came up to Mr. and Mrs. Budd, and, on the former asking them for protection, as he had been grossly insulted, they and two civilians, who came up, helped him along for a little distance, and then, as he was able to go without help, left him, when he and his wife got to their house, when he appeared to her to be in such a dangerous condition that she sent for a medical man (Mr. Couchman, the Mayor of Bedford), who immediately came to see him, and, after giving him some relief, left him for the night, but, upon being summoned again about half-past three a.m., found him dead.

Evidence was given in support of these facts; and counsel for the prisoners addressed the jury on their behalf. The learned Judge having summed up,

The jury returned a verdict of "Manslaughter."—His Lordship sentenced the prisoners to seven years' penal servitude.

HUNTINGDON.

July 22.—The commission was opened in this town to-day by the Lord Chief Baron. There were four causes entered for trial, one of which was marked for a special jury.

WESTERN CIRCUIT.

WINCHESTER.

NISI PRIUS COURT.—(Before the Lord Chief Justice ERLE and a Special Jury.)

July 18.—*Barnes v. Minchin.*—This was an action tried at the last Summer Assizes at Winchester, before Mr. Justice Williams and a special jury, when a verdict was found for the plaintiff, but on application to the Court above a new trial was granted, and the case now came on a second time for trial. The plaintiff, who was a messman on board the ship *Excellent*, at Portsmouth, had succeeded in saving a considerable sum of money, and was in the habit of employing from time to time Mr. Minchin, a solicitor of Portsmouth, to transact business for him, to make investments and such like. Mr. Minchin had a confidential clerk, a sort of factotum, named Reeves, who frequently saw the clients, and managed a great deal of the busi-

ness of the office, and who, it was said on the part of the plaintiff, acted as agent for Mr. Minchin. In the year 1857, the plaintiff lent on mortgage to a client of the defendant, a Miss Fanny Newman, the sum of £300, and in that transaction the plaintiff saw Reeves on several occasions. The subject of the present action arose out of a transaction which took place in May 1858. Reeves, it would seem, came to the plaintiff with Minchin's compliments, and said there was another Newman, a Mr. Edward Newman, who wanted to borrow £400. The plaintiff, treating Reeves as Minchin, paid over to him that sum in notes, a mortgage deed having been executed, sealed with Minchin's seal, and supposed by the plaintiff to have been duly executed. He thought he had made a safe investment, but the Newmans not paying their interest so regularly as he would like, he went on one occasion to Mr. Minchin's office and made inquiry about it. "Newman's interest?" said Mr. Minchin; "call in Reeves." Reeves was accordingly called in, and on being asked about it, said that Miss Fanny Newman was going to pay the interest shortly, and that Mr. Edward intended to pay off part of the principal. That was satisfactory to the plaintiff, and he went away. Reeves, however, subsequently absconded, when the mortgage deed, supposed to have been signed by Mr. Edward Newman, was taken to Mr. Minchin's office and discovered to be a forgery. Mr. Minchin died in September, 1861, and Mrs. Minchin, the executrix and present defendant, had sent in to the plaintiff accounts for business done by Reeves, which it was contended was another proof of the acknowledgment of Reeves as agent.

The plaintiff, on being called, proved that he had paid over money to Reeves in two other mortgage transactions not mentioned at the former trial—the names of the parties being Moody and Drake.

At the end of the plaintiff's case, it was submitted on the part of the defendant, that there was no evidence to prove the agency.

The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE was of opinion that the transactions with Moody and Drake altered the case as regarded agency from the former trial.

On the part of the defendant, it was contended that a man could not be said to be an agent to receive money who was merely in the habit of paying money into the bank for his employer, and that was the kind of business that Reeves did.

His LORDSHIP, in summing up, said before they could give a verdict for the plaintiff they must be satisfied that Minchin really gave authority to Reeves to receive large sums of money for him, or had so acted as to induce Barnes to believe that he was an authorised agent.

The jury said they were equally divided, but having retired for about an hour they ultimately returned a verdict for the plaintiff—damages, £400.

DORCHESTER.

July 22.—The commission was opened in this town to-day by Mr. Justice WILLES. There were only three causes entered for trial.

BANKRUPTCY LAW.

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY.

(Before Mr. Commissioner HOLROYD.)

July 20.—*In re David French.*—The bankrupt was a coal and corn merchant of Chatham.

The only noticeable feature in the proceedings was the light thrown upon cases administered out of court by means of inspectorships. It appeared that in July, 1862, the bankrupt called a meeting of his creditors, when a statement was submitted to them, showing a surplus of £2,800. An inspectorship was thereupon appointed. One of the inspectors so appointed now complained of the conduct of the co-inspectors and that of the bankrupt. A sum of £1,000, received in one lump, had been applied in a manner wholly different to the manner in which it would have been applied under bankruptcy—namely, to the payment of the claims of certain creditors in full, instead of equally among the entire body of creditors. Finding that a few months' inspectorship had sufficed to reduce the 20s. in the pound, with a surplus, into an offer of 4s. 6d. in the pound only, the anger of one of the inspectors became very great, and bankruptcy followed.

His HONOUR passed the bankrupt's examination, the question of discharge being adjourned.

(Before Mr. Commissioner FANE.)

July 22.—*In re Cole.*—Mr. C. E. Lewis said that in this case a petition in bankruptcy had been presented, and the usual

evidence was given in support of it. It was objected, however, that the person sought to be made a bankrupt had executed a deed of assignment for the benefit of his creditors, and that a majority in number, representing three-fourths in value, had in writing assented thereto. A certificate to that effect had been granted. From the evidence of Mr. Hammond, whose name appeared as an assenting creditor to the amount of £75, it seemed that he had never either personally or in writing assented to the proposition contained in the deed; and the bankrupt admitted that he inserted the name on the authority of a statement made by his clerk.

Mr. C. E. Lewis contended on these grounds that the certificate was inoperative, and that the assignment was an act of bankruptcy.

Mr. Doyle, for the trustee, said he was entitled to assume from the certificate that the deed was valid, and he did not consider, therefore, that he ought to give up the property which he held in trust for the creditors; at all events, time should be allowed in order to ascertain whether the evidence in support of the adjournment could be rebutted.

Mr. C. E. Lewis objected to any delay. The object of the bankruptcy was to protect the property.

His Honour said he was satisfied that he ought to adjudicate, and he made an order accordingly.

PARISH LAW.

DIVERSION OF ROAD.

Wright v. The Surveyor of Frant, Q. B., 11 W. R. 883.

It was held in the case of *Reg. v. The Justices of Worcestershire*, 3 E. & B. 477, that two justices have not jurisdiction to grant a certificate for the diversion of a highway unless the surveyors are authorised by the vestry to make the application. What persons constitute the vestry having the necessary jurisdiction is, therefore, the first question to be solved in cases relating to the diversion of roads, and is one that is not easily answered where there is a conflict between local and general Acts. It appears, in fact, that cases involving the diversion of a road within a district governed by a local Act have not been as yet provided for by the Legislature. It was laid down in *Reg. v. Paynter*, 13 Q. B. 399, that whenever a road comes within any of the terms relating to paving, repairing, cleansing, breaking-up, or diverting, under the provisions of a local Act, the General Highway Act (5 & 6 Will. 4, c. 50) does not apply. In the present case the repair of a certain road was taken out of the control of the parish in which it was situated, and placed under the management of commissioners appointed under a local Act; but there was no provision in this latter Act respecting the diversion of roads. Nevertheless, the Court of Queen's Bench held, on an appeal involving the point, that this defect in the local Act did not leave the inhabitants the power which, if there was no local Act, they would have under the General Highway Act, of directing the diversion of the roads in their parish by an order in vestry. The reason assigned by the Lord Chief Justice for this view was, that "the vestry" referred to in the General Highway Act meant the vestry of the parish bound to keep the road in repair, and that the parish in the present case having no duties in respect of the road in question, had consequently no correlative rights over it. The judgment involves an extension of the principle acted upon in the case of *Reg. v. The Justices of Worcestershire*, and shows that the jurisdiction given to justices by the General Highway Act can only be exercised after the proper statutory machinery has been set in motion—viz., on an application by the surveyor of the vestry liable to maintain the road in repair. It would, we think, appear, although his lordship expressed a doubt on the point, that the commissioners under the local Act, as they are the parties liable to maintain a road such as that in question, are consequently, in the absence of any statutory regulation to the contrary, the parties entitled to direct it; *ubi onus ibi debet esse jus*.

GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.

CHAMBERS OF CONCILIATION.

I have read with much interest your articles on these Chambers, and I shall be glad if you, or some of your readers, would tell me if it be intended that attorneys should be permitted to attend, on behalf of their clients, the hearing of cases in those courts.

J. T. S.

CHURCH RATES.

At a recent meeting of the parishioners of All Saints, Colchester, convened for the purpose of levying a church-rate, a motion was made and seconded that a rate of fourpence in the pound be made. An amendment was proposed that the rate be not compulsory, and that an adjournment for four weeks take place to consider the subject. It is believed that the amendment was a mere trick or device intended to render the levying of the rate illegal. The chairman was advised not to put the amendment, it being laid down in "Prideaux's Practical Guide to Churchwardens," 6th ed., p. 114, that the chairman is justified in declining to put such an amendment. The chairman also, on the same ground, refused to put another amendment, that there "be no rate."

I should feel obliged by any of your readers favouring me with an answer to the following queries:—

1. Was the chairman justified in refusing to put the amendments to the meeting? and 2. Would the rejection of the amendments, if they had been put, have afforded ground for the ousting of the jurisdiction of justices on the hearing of a summons for enforcing the rate?

July 22.

APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. HORATIO JAMES HUGGINS has been appointed Queen's Advocate for the colony of Sierra Leone.

Mr. WILLIAM CHAPMAN HALL, of Kensington-gardens-square, Bayswater, has been appointed a London Commissioner to administer oaths in the High Court of Chancery.

PARLIAMENT AND LEGISLATION.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, July 17.

JURORS' REMUNERATION BILL.

This bill was withdrawn.

JUDICIAL STATISTICS.

The Marquis of CLANRICARDE moved a resolution, "That in the session of 1856 this House resolved that 'a department for the collection of judicial statistics should be formed in connexion with the Home Office,' and 'should make an annual report to Parliament at a stated time, presenting returns in a collective form, illustrative of the state and progress of the administration of the law throughout the United Kingdom.' That, accordingly, such a report and return have been annually presented to Parliament since the year 1858 for England and Wales, and contains information of the greatest value: That, notwithstanding the resolution of 1856, and a pledge given by Ministers in debate upon the subject in July, 1861, no similar report has been made from Ireland: That it is expedient and necessary that judicial statistics from Ireland, similar to those for England and Wales, and to be presented at the same time, should be annually furnished; and with that view it is necessary that a person acquainted with the Irish courts, and otherwise competent, should be attached to the Home Office, and that all possible facilities and co-operation should be afforded to this officer by the several authorities in Dublin Castle and the various law courts of Ireland." He did not complain of his noble friend the President of the Council, or of any other member of the Government, for negligence in this matter; but he did complain of the law officers and advisers of the Irish Government for not having taken steps to procure the same information on the subject of judicial statistics in Ireland, which was regularly provided in England and Wales. His noble friend (Lord Brougham) deserved great thanks for having originally moved the resolutions under which the judicial statistics were prepared; but his noble friend's intention was that Ireland should have been included in those returns. ["Hear, hear," from Lord Brougham]. At present they had no means of ascertaining the business done in the Landed Estates' Court

They knew nothing of the litigation in Ireland, and they had no possibility of comparing the judicial returns of Ireland with those of England and Wales.

Earl GRANVILLE said that it must not go forth either that there were no judicial statistics collected in Ireland, or that there was any deliberate intention to obstruct their collection, or withhold information. But delay had undoubtedly taken place through the desire to make the returns as perfect and complete as possible. As, however, the delay had taken place, and he was not in a condition to give any satisfactory assurance to his noble friend, he would agree to the resolutions, if some modifications were made in them. He wished the passage referring to the attachment of the officer to the Home Office should be omitted.

The Earl of DONOUGHMORE thought that there were far too many judges in Ireland. If they were reduced in number, and made to work as hard as their brethren in England, the business would be much better done.

The Marquis of CLANRICARDE assented to the modification suggested by Earl Granville.

The resolutions, as amended, were then agreed to.

Monday, July 20.

ALTERATIONS IN JUDGES' CIRCUITS BILL.

This bill was read a third time and passed.

Thursday, July 23.

STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES' BILL.

This bill was read a third time and passed.

RAILWAYS CLAUSES BILL—WATERWORKS CLAUSES BILL.

These bills were read a second time.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, July 17.

PRIVATE BILL LEGISLATION.

Mr. R. HODGSON asked the President of the Board of Trade what course he intended to pursue with reference to the report and resolutions of the Private Bill Legislation Committee.

Mr. M. GIBSON said the committee came to a number of resolutions, and with regard to the first two of them they were recommended to bring in bills for the purpose of facilitating private bill legislation. The first of the resolutions had been already before the House, and the bill founded upon it had passed through committee. The bill to which the second resolution related was for the purpose of enabling parties to do certain things without the necessity of coming to Parliament for a special Act, and that bill was under preparation. It would not, however, be possible to get it ready for the present session. Some of the resolutions required the co-operation of the other House of Parliament, and therefore, until they had had an opportunity of ascertaining the views taken by the other House with respect to those resolutions, it would not be right for this House to take any action in the matter. However, with regard to the resolutions relating to their own fees and the minutes of evidence before their own committees, those were matters under consideration, and he would undertake on Tuesday next to say whether any action would be taken in respect of them during the present session.

COMPANIES CLAUSES BILL.

This bill was read a third time and passed.

Monday, July 20.

THE LAWS OF JERSEY.

Mr. HADFIELD asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he intended to bring in a bill or bills to carry into effect the recommendations of the Royal commissioners appointed in 1846 for inquiry into the criminal laws of Jersey, and the Royal commissioners appointed in 1859 for inquiry into the civil laws of Jersey, except such of them, if any, as had been already carried out by the States of Jersey; and particularly whether it was his intention, considering that the said States had declined to reform the Royal Court, to take any course, by legislation or otherwise, to carry out the recommendations of the said Royal commissioners (1859) on that subject.

Sir G. GREY said he had no present intention of proposing any bill on this subject.

BANKRUPTCY RETURNS.

Mr. MURRAY asked for an explanation of the delay in laying before Parliament the annual general return, to the 11th October, 1862, of the business of the respective offices in the Courts

of Bankruptcy, and registrars of county courts acting in bankruptcy (required by the 67th section of the Bankruptcy Act, 1861); and if it could be stated when the returns would be laid upon the table; and whether they would then be arranged under the authority of the Home Department, and published so as to complete the judicial statistics for the year 1862.

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL said it was a subject of great regret that these returns had not been laid upon the table of the House in proper time, but the delay had not arisen from any want of urgency upon the part of the Lord Chancellor. The gentleman whose duty it was to make the returns had suffered very much in his health, but had been very unwilling to allow his duties to devolve upon others. He was informed, however, that the returns would certainly be laid on the table on Monday next, and the judicial statistics of the year would be completed as soon as possible.

THE RAILWAYS CLAUSES BILL.

This bill was read a third time and passed.

Tuesday, July 21.

BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY COURT (DUBLIN).

Mr. VANCE called attention to the insufficient accommodation afforded to the bar, the suitors, and the public, in the court in which the sittings in bankruptcy and insolvency are held in Dublin; and moved for a copy of any correspondence which had taken place between the judges of the court and the Government on the subject. He said that plans and estimates for building new courts had been prepared two years ago, but the hopes held out had been disappointed, and no vote for the purpose had been proposed in the estimates. The entire bankruptcy business of Ireland, and a great part of the insolvency business, were carried on in this court, and the business had greatly increased since 1857.

Mr. F. PEEL would not deny that the accommodation provided in these courts was of a character unsuited for permanent occupation. He was not aware that any promise to provide a remedy had been held out as long ago as two years. The first he heard of the subject was in March last, when the estimates for public buildings in Ireland had practically been prepared. Even if the estimate of £12,000 for the construction of these new courts had been previously received it would not have made any difference, the estimate for public buildings in Ireland this year exceeding by one-fifth the average amount. It was quite possible that the commission at present sitting to inquire into the Irish law courts might lead to considerable reductions and amalgamations, in which case it would probably become unnecessary to erect additional buildings. The subject, however, would be kept in mind.

Colonel DUNN hoped the Government would do something more than keep the subject in mind. The Bankruptcy Court was quite as necessary as the buildings at South Kensington, and vastly more useful.

The motion was agreed to.

JURISDICTION OF JUSTICES BILL.

This bill was read a third time and passed.

ALTERATIONS IN JUDGES' CIRCUITS BILL.

This bill was read a second time.

PROMISSORY NOTES AND BILLS OF EXCHANGE BILL.

This bill was read a third time and passed.

Wednesday, July 22.

STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL.

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL, in moving that the House should go into committee on this bill, said it constituted a very important step in that course of improvement which had been contemplated for a length of time. The House must be aware that the revision of the statute law, with a view to the issue of an amended and expurgated edition, was a necessary preliminary to any measure of consolidation. That had long been an object on which the House and the country had deemed it worth while to spend no inconsiderable amount of money. There had been two commissions on the subject. The first was issued a good many years back, and comprised several distinguished persons. It cost no less than about £37,000. Of course a mass of materials was collected by that commission, but otherwise their labours had no result, except the production of a bill for the consolidation of the criminal law, which was not passed when first brought forward, but which partially supplied the foundation of the Act subsequently passed for that purpose. Another commission was afterwards issued when Lord Cranworth was Lord Chancellor, which did not prove quite so

expensive, although it cost £21,000. The fruits of the labours of the second commission consisted of a digested register of statutes, from the 11th year of George III. to the present time, upon which a measure of undoubted utility was founded. The principle upon which the register was compiled was that of tracing backwards the statutes from the present time, and noting the direct and specific operation of subsequent or earlier enactments. Its advantage was limited, therefore, to pointing out the direct relation of one statute to another, but it did not indicate the indirect effect which statutes sometimes had on those of earlier date. The Act of 1861 was intended to accomplish the revision of the statute law from the union of Ireland downwards, but its usefulness was under the same limitation to which he had referred in regard to the register. The late Lord Campbell, then Lord Chancellor, and the noble lord now on the woolsack, when Attorney-General, deemed it desirable that the system of revision should be extended, so as to take within its scope the indirect as well as the direct effect of statutes. The result was the bill now before the House, which gave effect to a revision of the legislation of Parliament from the reign of King Edward I. down to James II. All the Acts during that period which had expired, which had been exhausted in their operation, which had been repealed either specifically or virtually by succeeding enactments, or which had become obsolete, were to be removed from the statute-book. The House had been furnished with the notes of the two learned gentlemen who had conducted the revision, in order that it might know the grounds on which they included any Act in the schedule of the bill. It must be manifest to the House that if it desired to see this useful work accomplished, it must give a certain amount of confidence to those who had been concerned in the preparation of the measure. Nothing could be more idle than a proposal to refer such a bill to a select committee. The idea was, in fact, so absurd that no one had suggested it. [Mr. HENNESSY.—I did.] He had not observed any such suggestion on the notice paper, and, with all deference to the hon. member, he must repeat that it was a very idle one. The House might, of course, if it thought fit, refuse to advance at all in the direction of revising and expurgating the statute-book; but it was impossible that the House could go through the work which the gentlemen who drew up the schedule had done. No select committee, unless composed of lawyers of great knowledge and ability, could undertake the task; and even if they sat continuously, it would take them years to go through the statute-book. Lord St. Leonard's, who was well known to be at once as learned in the law as any man living, and as little likely to favour rash alterations, said in another place that the gentlemen employed in this matter had proved themselves to be trustworthy by their former services, and that Parliament ought to accept their work very much on trust. Lord Cranworth, Lord Brougham, Lord Chelmsford, and, in fact, all those in the other House best competent to judge, had taken the same view. The gentlemen who had prepared the present schedule were also the authors of the register, and he had not heard that during the time which had elapsed since the register was embodied in an Act any error had been discovered in it. In fact, a more conscientious, scrupulous, and careful performance of the duty it was impossible to conceive. Whenever any doubt had been felt as to whether an enactment was or was not now operative in law, it had been retained; and the gentlemen engaged had from time to time referred such questions to the Lord Chancellor and the law officers of the Crown, who had given them attentive consideration, and shared the responsibility of the decision which was arrived at. The gentlemen to whose labours they owed the Bill now before the House—and it was as perfect a piece of work of its kind as could well be—were in good practice as barristers, and held a high reputation. They had been employed from October, 1859, to the present time, and during the whole of that period they had not received more than £3,125, which was a very small sum compared with the expenses of the previous commission. The hon. member for King's County had placed on the notice paper amendments to strike certain Acts out of the schedule, and he was very glad that an opportunity would thus be afforded of proving the merits of the measure by testing a particular part of it. He moved that the House should go into committee on the Bill.

Sir F. KELLY concurred in much that had fallen from his hon. and learned friend. Without a measure, or rather a series of measures, dealing with the whole of the statute law from Magna Charta to the present time, it would be utterly impossible not only to effect a consolidation of the statutes, but even to take a single step towards a revised edition of them. By

judicious consolidation the statute law, which now filled about forty-three closely printed folio volumes, might be reduced to four or five volumes at the most, containing some 300 Acts, and that was obviously an object of great importance. Of the entire litigation of the country, about a fourth was occasioned by the difficulty, and in some cases the impossibility, of determining what was and what was not impliedly repealed in the statute law. Hence it was of great importance that expurgation should be extended to enactments which were impliedly as well as those which were expressly repealed. The present measure would reduce the statutes from forty-three to perhaps thirty volumes. [The SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—"To eight."] He was glad to hear the remark of his hon. and learned friend, but if the present measure would bring down the statute law to eight volumes, the further expurgation he had suggested would reduce them to three or four. Moreover, if they stopped here they would leave untouched another grievance. At present the forty-three volumes of statutes contained nearly 1,500,000 separate and distinct enactments, without any classification, and extending over 500 or 600 years. For instance, the enactments constituting the law of real property ranged over a period of 550 years, and numbered between 600 and 800. That objectionable state of things would remain unremedied unless consolidation proceeded along with expurgation.

Mr. HENNESSY objected to any further progress of the bill this session. The House had been told that the present bill, if passed, would do away with almost all the statute laws from Magna Charta to the end of the reign of James II. He found, however, on examining the schedule that the bill, if converted into an Act to-morrow, would leave about 1,000 statutes unrepealed. One of the Acts left unrepealed was the 3 Edw. 1. c. 2, which provided that a clerk convicted of felony should be delivered to the ordinary and should not depart without purgation. Another was the 3 Edw. 1. c. 6, which enacted that a villein saving his wainage should have amercement. He had objections to other parts of the bill. It was proposed to sweep away old statutes, which had either been virtually repealed or had become obsolete. One of the statutes said to be dealt with was the 28 Edw. 4. c. 11, with respect to which the framers of the bill said in a note, "It seems doubtful whether the repeal, which is of so much of a statute made in the 28th Edw. III., as relates to making cry and fresh suit, and to hundreds and franchises being answerable as therein mentioned, covers so much as relates to inquests; but if not, it is considered this portion is either virtually repealed or is obsolete." Another statute to be repealed was 28th Edw. 3. c. 13, which might be called the Magna Charta of aliens and denizens in this country. The framers of the bill said this statute was unnecessary; but it was cited almost every day in our courts of law—whenever, in fact, a question was raised as to a mixed jury. There were a great many other statutes described in the bill as obsolete or unnecessary, and consequently, fit to be repealed, which were cited in the text-books of Sugden, Archbold, and Broome, as being in full force at the present moment. He observed that the framers of the bill, misled by its title, proposed to repeal the 24th Hen. 3. c. 4. That Act was entitled "An Act concerning the sowing of flax and hemp;" but, as Lord St. Leonard's had pointed out, it was actually the statute on which the law of England depended as to the measurement of statute labour. Of another Act which the bill proposed to repeal, the same noble and learned lord said that, though nearly obsolete, it was not quite so, and he mentioned a recent case within his own knowledge. Among the Acts to be repealed was the 12th Charles 2. c. 24, which took away the court of wards and liveries, and tenures in capite and by knights' service and purveyance, and settled a revenue upon His Majesty in lieu thereof. Upon this provision of the bill a very important question, involving the privileges of the House, arose. He also mentioned several other objections to the bill, and moved, as an amendment, that the House should go into committee on the bill that day week.

Sir H. CAINES said a satisfactory answer could be given to every one of the objections noted by the hon. member. This was only part of a far larger scheme. It was proposed to produce that the want of which had been a crying disgrace for many years—an expurgated edition of the statutes, containing nothing but those Acts which were in force at the present time. No legislation was required with respect to Acts which had already been expressly repealed, but there was another class of enactments to be dealt with—those which had not been expressly repealed, but which had expired, become obsolete, or been repealed by implication. In 1861, without the

aid of a select committee, an Act was passed performing the office he had described upon all statutes ranging from 11 Geo. III., 1771, to 1860. The present bill dealt with the period before the Revolution, and if it were carried, the only statutes remaining to be dealt with would be those enacted from 1668 to 1771. He believed the effect of the whole scheme would be to reduce the statute-book from forty-three to somewhere about eight volumes; and, for his own part, he could not conceive a more desirable operation. The framers of this bill deserved the confidence of the House. They were remarkable for accuracy and intelligence, and it was highly to their credit that whereas about £50,000 had been expended on statute-law commissions, the work which led to the Act passed in 1861, and to the compilation of the present bill, had been done for £3,000 or £4,000.

Mr. AYTON supported the amendment, and observed that if the proposition made some years ago, that a compendious edition of the statutes to be printed and published at the public expense had been adopted, there would have been no necessity for the present measure. That project would have placed in the hands of the legal profession and our public bodies a convenient and useful compendium of existing Acts, which would depend for its authority upon the accuracy and the character of the editors who framed it. The editors could set to work with freedom, and if any part of their labours turned out to be faulty, reference could be made to the statutes to correct their errors, and no wrong or injustice would be done. If that course had been pursued, the task of preparing a valuable compendium of our living statute-law might by this date have been accomplished.

Mr. HENNESSEY afterwards withdrew his amendment, and the House went into committee; and clauses 1, 2, and 3, after slight discussion were agreed to.

The schedule, after some discussion and a few amendments was also agreed to, and the House resumed.

Thursday, July 23.

COUNTY COURTS BUILDINGS.

Mr. AUGUSTUS SMITH asked the Secretary to the Treasury under what regulations grants were made from the consolidated fund in aid of the erection of buildings of which the use is obtained for holding the county courts, and what precautions were taken by the Treasury to secure such buildings, on which the public money was so expended, being in all respects suitable for the purposes intended.

Mr. PEEL said that there was no regulation under which such grants were made, but the Treasury entered into the best bargains they could in those cases.

THE CROWN SOLICITOR IN BANKRUPTCY.

Mr. COX asked the following questions of the Solicitor-General:—1. Whether in the amounts he stated on Thursday last as the remuneration received by the Crown Solicitor in the Court of Bankruptcy he included the sums received by such solicitor from bankrupts for the fees payable on adjourned meetings; and whether such amounts included the sums received by such solicitor under the second clause of the general orders of the 22nd day of February, 1862. 2. When an order in bankruptcy by the Lord Chancellor, reducing the fee payable to Mr. W. W. Aldridge, under the order of the 22nd of February, 1862, from £3 to £2, was made; and whether such order had been laid upon the table of the House pursuant to the Act of the 24th and 25th Vict. c. 134. 3. Under what clause of the Bankruptcy Act of 1861, or of any other Act of Parliament, the Lord Chancellor made the general orders of the 22nd of February, 1862, appointing Mr. Aldridge not only the solicitors for all petitions *in forma pauperis*, but also appointing him the solicitor to act in the prosecution of all bankruptcies where no creditors' assignee was chosen at the first meeting of creditors, and directing that "in every bankruptcy prosecuted by such solicitor, and not being under a petition *in forma pauperis*, the bill of costs, charges, fees, and disbursements of such solicitor shall be taxed and paid in like manner as bills of costs of other solicitors in matters of bankruptcy are taxed and paid."

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL said that the gross sum he had mentioned on a former occasion as having been paid to Mr. Aldridge was only the sum paid from the account standing in the name of the Accountant-General in Bankruptcy, and it did not include the amount paid to him in respect of other branches of his employment. The gross sum received by Mr. Aldridge from all sources, during the first year of his appoint-

ment, was £3,565 8s. 5d.; and, deducting the disbursements, the net sum he received was £1,519 7s. 10d. The gross receipts during the third half-year were £1,689 8s. 8d.; and, deducting disbursements, the net receipts for that half-year were £623 1s. 11d. With regard to the second question of the hon. gentleman, he had to state that the facts were as follows. The Lord Chancellor had originally made arrangements for a single year's remuneration, with the intention that any subsequent allowance should be made dependent on the working of the first year. On looking at the account of the last half-year of the first year, the Lord Chancellor saw that a larger sum had been received than he had anticipated, and, therefore, in the month of December, 1862, he ordered Mr. Aldridge to be told that his remuneration for the future should not exceed two-thirds of the amount received under the original arrangement. On the 12th of April, 1863, he directed a formal order to be drawn up to that effect, but that order had not yet been formally signed, in consequence of the illness of the chief registrar in bankruptcy. The future remuneration of Mr. Aldridge would thus not exceed £1,900 a year. In reply to the last question of the hon. member, he (the Solicitor-General) had to state that the Lord Chancellor made the order under the authority given to him by the Bankruptcy Act of 1861. He would take that opportunity of further stating, that he held in his hand a letter from the three commissioners in bankruptcy, in which they stated that "they were of opinion that a more efficient officer than Mr. Aldridge for the duties that devolved upon him in the Court of Bankruptcy could not have been selected; and that his services had been most useful as a security to the Court and in the interest of the suitors."

PRIVATE BILL LEGISLATION.

Mr. D. GRIFFITH asked the President of the Board of Trade whether, as chairman of the committee on private bill legislation, as well as in his official capacity, he intended to take any and what steps, in order to give effect to the recommendations of the committee, or to effect any other alteration in existing practice, as to solicitors, for charges for copies of evidence; and also as to the *ad valorem* duties on private bills, in the House of Commons.

Mr. M. GIBSON said that the committee had passed several resolutions, and the evidence taken by them had been printed, and would be shortly laid on the table. The government thought it better not to propose any action on those resolutions this session; considering the lateness of the session, and the fact that many members were daily leaving town, it was not desirable to propose an important change in the practice of the House.

In reply to a question from Mr. WHALLEY,

Mr. M. GIBSON said that it was the intention of the government to introduce a bill at the commencement of next session to enable promoters of undertakings in which all parties were assenting to carry out certain works by the aid of the provisions of a general measure, the compliance with which will be required to be certified to a department of the government.

PARTNERSHIP LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

This bill was read a third time and passed.

LAND REGISTRY.

RETURN to an Address of the Honourable The House of Commons, dated June 11, 1863:—for

- "Returns of the names of all persons holding any offices in the Office of Land Registry, established under the Act 25 & 26 Vict. c. 53; salary paid to each, and whether or not previously employed in the public service, and in what capacity."
- "Of the names of any persons appointed by the Lord Chancellor to any office under the Act 25 & 26 Vict. c. 67, and the salaries payable to each."
- "Of the number of applications for registration of any estates, freehold or leasehold, with or without an indefeasible title, and the number of all transfers or land certificates made to, or by, or under the Office of Land Registry, together with the amount of fees received in the said office since its establishment."
- "And, of all applications to obtain a declaration of title under the Act 25 & 26 Vict. c. 67."

Return of the names of all persons holding any offices in the Office of Land Registry, established under the Act 25 & 26

Vict. c. 53; salary paid to each, and whether or not previously employed in the public service, and in what capacity, &c.

Date of Appointment.	Names.	Offices.	Salaries.
12 Aug. 1863.*	Brent Spencer Follett, Esq., Q.C.	Registrar.	£ 2,500 per ann.
"	Robert Hallett Holt, Esq.	Assistant Registrar.	1,500 "
"	Octavius D. Mor-daunt . . .	Chief Clerk	400 "
"	Robert John Abraham . .	Second Clk	250 "
	John Bullar, Esq., Barrister-at-Law	Examiner of Title.	No salary.
	Charles David-son, Esq., Bar-rister-at-Law.	Do.	Do.

Mr. R. J. Abraham was for some time clerk in the Census Office, London. None of the other persons have been previously employed in the public service.

No person has been appointed by the Lord Chancellor to any office under the Act 25 & 26 Vict. c. 67.

Return of the number of applications for registration of estates freehold or leasehold, with or without an indefeasible title, and of the number of all transfers or land certificates made to, or by, or under the Office of Land Registry, together with the amount of fees received by the said office since its establishment.

Thirty-four applications for registration have been made, comprising property estimated to exceed half a million sterling in value.

Three land certificates have been granted.

No transfer has yet been made of any registered property.

The amount of fees received by the office since its establishment is £70. The fees of the office before the *ad valorem* fee, which is paid on the actual registration of the property being completed, are of very small amount.

There has been no application to obtain a declaration of title under the Act 25 & 26 Vict. c. 67.

B. SPENCER FOLLETT.

Registrar of the Office of Land Registry.

IRELAND.

Mr. Edward Tickell, Q.C., late Chairman of the County Armagh, died at his residence in Clare-street, Dublin, on the 18th inst.

COLONIAL TRIBUNALS & JURISPRUDENCE.

AUSTRALIA.

The Melbourne correspondent of the *Times*, in a recent communication, referring to the immigration of the Chinese into that colony, and their peculiar characteristics, observes that, "although they admit that in their own country all judicial tribunals are corrupt, and that justice, or injustice, can always be bought, they soon come to perceive and appreciate the impartiality of English courts, and their tenacity on points of right, and their taste for litigation secures them the respect of attorneys. In our towns and at the gold fields no cause list would now look complete without a few Chinese names in it. Their powers of giving evidence are as amazing as is their fastidiousness as to the manner in which they are sworn. Some of them in the witness-box blow out a lucifer-match; some burn a strip of yellow paper with Chinese characters inscribed thereon; and one once, in my hearing, at Ballarat, refused to be sworn at all, but upon the ceremony of chopping off the head of a cock at one blow. In vain was the witness tempted with lucifer match, wax candle, china saucer, and every other article at once handy, and deemed likely to bear on the Chinese conscience. He was inexorable, and as his evidence was important, and poultry was at that time scarce in the township, the court, jury, and practitioners were kept waiting while messengers scoured right and left in search of the necessary victim. On the cock being brought into court, emitting a cluck of terror whenever he could disengage his beak from the

hand of a roguish or a nervous Irish policeman, even judicial gravity was sorely tried; and yet this was not all. A second commission became necessary to go in quest of a chopper, common pocket-knives being of no use, as the "one blow" was carefully explained by the interpreter as being so indispensable that cock after cock must be offered up if there were any failure in this particular. The chopper was at last procured, the cock satisfactorily beheaded, and the Chinaman's conscience satisfied, whereupon, so exhausted was the witness's virtue by its preliminary effort, that he burst at once into a paroxysm of perjury, which satisfied all that he was not nearly so particular in the substance of his evidence as he had been in the form of his oath."

FOREIGN TRIBUNALS & JURISPRUDENCE.

FRANCE.

A NURSE'S LIEN.

Jurists are in general agreed on this point of law, namely, that a child placed out at nurse cannot, in case of the sudden death of its relatives, serve as a guarantee for payment, as a kind of living pledge for the benefit of the nurse who has not been paid her monthly arrears. The question is of greater practical interest than might be imagined at a first glance, principally in relation to natural children. The *juge des référés* has been called upon lately to decide in a case of this kind, under circumstances as sad as interesting. After having shone for a certain time on the turf, at races, at the small theatres, and at Mabile, thanks to wealthy *liaisons*, one of the stars of the *demi-monde* went to die in the municipal *maison de sante* of the Faubourg Saint Denis, on the 30th of May last, of a severe illness, the consequence of a confinement. This unexpected and terrible death left unprotected an infant of six months old, whom the deceased had placed at nurse in Paris-Montmartre for 50 francs a month, at the house of Mme. Lassiaz. This woman, who had only been paid three months in advance, is still a privileged creditor, for these reasons, to the amount of 275 francs. Two relatives of the ex-princess of the *demi-monde*, in a very unpretending condition, wished to take little Victorine out of the house of Mme. Lassiaz, to bring her up at Colmar, in their humble dwelling. Mme. Lassiaz alleged that the child could not be taken away from her before the payment of the 275 francs for the months of nursing. From this resulted an *assignation en référé*, at the demand of the *dames S. M. Charles des Etangs, avoué* of the plaintiffs, called attention to the fact that they were proceeding in a matter of natural succession. The *dames S.* acted without *attribution de qualités*. A judicial administrator will concentrate all the disposable resources of the succession, that is 3,000 or 4,000 francs at most. There will be a distribution by contribution, and it is to that that Mme. Lassiaz ought to address herself. In no case can the child, under any title, remain, as it were, as a guarantee. There is cause to order the remission of the child to her grandmother and aunt. M. Fossier, *avoué* of Mme. Lassiaz, replied that his client would lose all power of recovering her money after the departure of the child. He demanded the preliminary deposit of a sum of 275 francs, representing the months due for nursing. The president said that, on the product of the sale of furniture, the judicial administrator should be required to pay 100 francs on account to Mme. Lassiaz, who should immediately give up the child to the relatives who claimed her, referring Mme. Lassiaz for the surplus to the distribution by contribution amongst all the creditors of the money proceeding from the sale of furniture; all the rights of the parties being expressly reserved.

COPYRIGHT IN MUSIC.

Meyerbeer composed a march for the Government of the King of Prussia; it was executed at the ceremonies at Königsberg; a lady heard it for the first time, retained it in her memory, wrote it down, arranged it for the piano, and had it lithographed. A music-seller in Berlin, Herr Schlesinger, had bought of the celebrated composer the right of printing this occasional piece. He now attacked the lady, the lithographer, and the tradesman who had sold what he called a counterfeit. A lawsuit followed, in which the accused were acquitted; the tribunal was not willing to recognise a crime in this reproduction by a wonderful effort of memory after a single hearing.

FALSE IMPRISONMENT.

A trial has recently taken place before the Imperial Court of Paris, in which two neighbours—a M. Ferras and a Mme.

* This is obviously an error, and should be 1862.—Ed. S. J.

Choisy—were at loggerheads. M^{me}. Choisy accused M. Ferras of making a noise at night, and disturbing her slumbers, and applied to the police magistrate for the quarter to redress what she called her wrongs. The magistrate very properly refused to interfere, the matter not being within his competence, whereupon M^{me}. Choisy sent her servant at two in the morning to a neighbouring guardhouse. A corporal's guard speedily made its appearance, and knocked up M. Ferras, who was asleep. M. Ferras had nothing to do but to submit, and was accordingly marched off between three musketeers, at three o'clock in the morning, deposited in the black hole, and marched off again the same morning to the commissary of police, who immediately released him. He immediately brought an action for false imprisonment against M^{me}. Choisy, who was sentenced to a fortnight's imprisonment, and to pay the plaintiff 1,000 francs (£40) by way of damages. Against this sentence she appealed, alleging that the corporal's guard did it all; that she only meant to frighten her neighbour, and by no means to have him arrested. The Court quashed the sentence of the Court below, congratulated M. Ferras on the moderation he had displayed, and—adjudged him to pay the costs! Commenting upon this case, M. Hervé, in the *Courrier du Dimanche*, remarks with great force, that the sentence was quite in accordance with the law, and therefore that nothing remains but to deplore the state of a legislation which allows such inconsiderate arrests to take place without anyone being responsible for them. This arbitrary and irresponsible power of a corporal's guard is, however, no new feature in France, and the late Marshal Bugeaud used to say that every man in the country was at the mercy of "quatre hommes et un caporal."

REVIEW.

A Selection of Leading Cases on the Law relating to Real Property, Conveyancing, and the Construction of Wills and Deeds; with Notes. By OWEN DAVIES TUDOR, Esq., of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law. Second edition. Butterworths. 1863.

The logical rule, *argumentum a particulari ad universale non valet*, has a more extensive signification in logic than it has in law. Lord Coke, indeed, has said of cases in law, that *nullum simile quatuor pedibus currit*; but this observation, if construed strictly, would amount to saying that there could be no such thing as a case in point. There is, indeed, an essential distinction between ordinary reports and leading cases; and the law student who intended to acquire a knowledge of law by reading through numerous reports, would ultimately find that he merely confused his memory, if not his perception, by such a course, while he added but little to his previous stock of knowledge. Leading cases, however, involving *ex vi termini*, as they do, an exposition of certain fundamental principles of law, bear a wholly different relation to our juristical system; they are, as it were, the buttresses and columns of the structure of which ordinary cases are but the crude materials. After the student has acquired even a slight knowledge of the leading rules of law, he could not adopt a better mode of imparting form and outline to the learning to be further acquired by him than by a perusal of the standard selections of leading cases. It is for the practitioner, however, that such works are chiefly intended; and if any case that comes before him in practice has a correlative amongst the "Leading Cases" he will be certain to find there its principle duly noted, together with a thorough discussion of all its various modifications. History has been not inaptly described as "philosophy teaching by example," and so it may be said with perfect truth of all works on leading cases, that they introduce Themis in the most attractive costume, and inculcating her rules in the most concrete and effective form. To Mr. Tudor alone are we indebted for three great works of this kind. He is one of the authors of the very valuable selection of Leading Cases in Equity, and the sole author of the "Leading Cases in Mercantile Law," as well as of the subject of the present notice. His works thus form a tripod of legal intelligence, a recourse to which will rarely, if ever, be found unsatisfactory. Indeed, he may fairly say of his juristical labours,—

"*Quæ regio in terris nostri non plena laboris?*"

Of the three departments of equity, mercantile law, and real property, in which our author has laboured with so much success and distinction, the province of which the work before us treats, admits least of an exposition by means of a selection of leading cases. Equity appears to be the department of our legal system which offers the greatest facilities for the

compilation of an elaborate selection of this kind. The chief branches of the jurisdiction of that court consist of usurpations of the functions of the tribunals at Westminster. These aggressions were conducted on no defined principle, but were seldom omitted when they could be attempted with any great probability of success. Consisting thus of piecemeal acquisitions, the leading principles of equity jurisprudence find their natural embodiment in those cases in which they first obtained a substantial recognition by that court. Both Mr. J. W. Smith, and Mr. Tudor, have shown that a tolerably complete treatise upon numerous branches of the common law may likewise be given in the shape of a selection of leading cases. Neither the department of common law, however, nor that of real property, presents to the compiler of such cases equal facilities with those afforded by the decisions in chancery. The common law, so far as the essential juristical elements of a contract are concerned, is almost coincident with the natural or moral law. It is, therefore, best treated of in an *a priori* form. Our law of real property is the very reverse of this, as it is based almost exclusively upon feudal and technical rules. These so permeate our whole real property code, and admit of such a great variety of deductive applications, that a number of leading decisions on questions relating to real property might fairly be expected rather to indicate than cast much light upon the labyrinthine intricacies of that branch of law. So ably, however, has Mr. Tudor executed this portion of his labours, that the work before us comprises a digest of decisions which, if not exhaustive of all the principles of our real property code, will at least be found to leave nothing untouched or unelaborated under the numerous legal doctrines to which the cases severally relate.

Although this work is not intended to treat of our real property code according to any logical plan, yet the cases are very well arranged, especially with respect to the progressive complexity of the questions they are intended to illustrate. Commencing with the slender legal rights of a tenant at sufferance, the author proceeds next to treat of estates for life, then of commons, easements, advowsons, and rents, then of uses, with reference to which he very perspicuously explains the distinction between conveyances operating by transmutation of possession, and instruments not so operating. There is next a commentary on the extinguishment and execution of powers. This part of the subject could, we think, be conveniently consolidated with the previous passages relating to uses, especially as it is a vexed question whether general powers can be reserved in deeds not operating by transmutation of possession (*vide* Lord St. Leonards' Treatise on Powers, p. 133, 8th ed.; and on the other side, Law Magazine and Review, vol. 13, p. 306). Next follows an excellent dissertation on the law of perpetuity, trusts for accumulation, and mortmain. Then comes a compendious abridgment of the law relative to the rule in *Shelley's case*. The difficult questions appertaining to estates by implication are next discussed in all their phases by the author, with his usual ability. He unfolds with care the law applicable to cross-remainders in the case of executory trusts and estates arising by implication from recitals. *Wyll's case*, *Forth v. Chapman* (in which the same words receive a twofold construction with respect to realty and to personality), and *Seymour's case* next follow, with an account of the case of *Sturgis v. Moore*, 28 Beav. 398, in which the law of entails has received the latest definition of its statutory incidents. Escheat, gifts to a class, vested and contingent devises and bequests, executory devises, joint tenancy, and lapse, are next successively treated of. The important and fresh case of *Hiscocks v. Hiscocks*, 5 M. & W. 363, next follows, in which the law of extrinsic evidence is treated of, in respect of wills, with the usual succinctness of detail. Merger and repugnant conditions next come under Mr. Tudor's review; and the work closes with an account of the law applicable to general devises. The cases might have, we think, been grouped in classes, according as they relate to limitations of an estate, incorporeal hereditaments, or wills. However, the work is not intended to be read consecutively even by the student. To Mr. Tudor's treatment of all these subjects, so complicated and so varied, we accord our entire commendation. There are no omissions of any important cases relative to the various branches of law comprised in the work, nor are there any omissions or defects in his statement of the law itself applicable to the cases discussed by him. We cordially recommend the work to the practitioner and student alike, but especially to the former.

The cast-iron framework of our real property system can never properly be even in the least disregarded by a writer on feudal law. If a new question in conveyancing were to be mooted to-morrow, in which an adhesion to a technical rule

would work even the grossest injustice, there is no doubt that, in the absence of fraud, the *Ita lex scripta est* of the common law, if directly or indirectly applicable to the question under discussion, would prevail. This observation, we think, applies not only to the construction of deeds—a proposition which admits of no dispute—but also to the construction of wills and executory agreements. Most of our leading writers on real property law incline to the strict observance of the letter of all feudal rules. Of this tendency Mr. Fearn affords a striking instance in his discussion on the rule in *Shelley's case* in connection with the case of *Perrin v. Platte*, 1 W. Bl. 662; *Fearn*, Con. Rem., on which there is an interesting commentary in the treatise before us. Lord St. Leonards, throughout all his works, especially in his Treatise on Powers, and Mr. Lewis in his admirable work on the Law of Perpetuity, indicate the same juristical tastes. A similar disposition we find on the part of Mr. Tudor in the work before us. Such a combination—we might say school—of legal authors shows that the best legal authorities appear to consider that the common law would lose somewhat of its integrity and essence if subjected very freely to a natural or non-technical interpretation of its rules. Mr. Tudor's mind could not be biased by his strenuous cultivation of the specialities of feudal law, since his researches have extended so widely over the adjacent provinces of equity and mercantile law. Nevertheless, if, in complete discharge of our functions as critics, we must qualify our essentially thorough approval of the work before us, we would say that Mr. Tudor gives the feudal rules of our real property code at least their full juristical value. For instance, in his commentary on *Bishop v. Bishop*, 10 L. J. N. S. Ch. 302; and *Dickson v. Hamer*, 1 Drew. & Sm. 284, he appears to think that a dowress, before an actual assignment of her dower, has not such an estate in the lands as will support her rights even in equity. An estate, in the technical sense of the term, she certainly has not in the lands prior to an assignment; but then she has an interest whereon she may graft any equity necessary to protect her rights. Mr. Tudor would appear to think that equity followed the law strictly in respect of interests in land; but such is not the case. This is very well explained by himself under the heading of *Forbes v. Moffat*, 18 Ves. 384, and *Lushington v. Boldero*, 13 Beav. 418; where he (p. 97) distinguishes equitable from legal waste. Our author adopts (p. 410) the opinion of Mr. Lewis (*Perpet.*, sup. 125) that the rule against perpetuities is applicable to remainders. This opinion is, we think, correct, although it is opposed to the opinion of Lord St. Leonards. (Treatise on Powers, p. 2, 7th ed.) Mr. Tudor offers what he justly designates "a conclusive argument" in favour of his view—viz., the fact that the *cypres* doctrine was invented to validate remainders that otherwise would be void for remoteness. In connection with the question of perpetuity our author gives an able discussion (p. 420) on the vexed question whether the rule applies to the common powers of sale and exchange in settlements. In his list (p. 427) of exceptions to the rule, however, we find an omission of leases *par autre vie*—these, as Lord St. Leonards has observed in his edition of Gilbert on Uses cannot be subject to the rule on account of the exility of the interest which they comprise. Perhaps Mr. Tudor considered he had already sufficiently indicated his opinion on this point in his account (p. 43) of the case of *McClintock v. Irvine*, 10 Ir. Ch. Rep. 480, in which Lord Chancellor Brady held that words of limitation were not necessary in equity to pass such a *quasi fee*.

The present edition omits *Chudleigh's case*, 1 Popham, 70, and *Corbet's case*, 1 Co. 83 a., although given in the first edition. These omissions are balanced only by the addition of a single fresh case—that of *Lord Braybrooke v. Inskip*, 8 Ves. 417. The omission from a practical work of a case involving such extremely abstract learning as *Chudleigh's case* is not to be much regretted; but we think that *Corbet's case*, analysing as it did the essential incidents of an estate at law, might have been suffered to retain its place. The notes have been so largely increased that the present edition exceeds its predecessor by 170 pages. We regret that the author has not favoured us with a more abundant supply of his own criticisms with respect to cases involving any conflict of judicial authority; for, judging by his able treatment of details, we are readily inclined to believe that he is equally competent to elucidate the more general laws of jurisprudence. We consider the work before us to indicate the hand of a master who has not indulged in unnecessary discussions upon merely speculative points, and yet, at the same time, has digested in a sufficiently didactic shape the *spolia optima* of our legal records.

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

BILLS IN PARLIAMENT.

The following bills for the formation of new lines of railway have been read a third time and passed in the House of Lords:—
SOUTH LONDON, TOOTING, &c., JUNCTION.
NEWCASTLE AND STARBECK.

The following bills for the formation of new lines of railway have been read a third time and passed in the House of Commons:—

BRECON AND MERTHYR TYDFIL.
ESK VALLEY.

PROJECTED COMPANIES.

THE ORIENTAL HOTELS COMPANY (LIMITED).

Capital, £250,000, in 25,000 shares of £10 each (with power to increase to £1,000,000).

Solicitors—Messrs. Uptons, Johnson, & Upton, 20, Austin Friars, E.C.

This company has been formed for the purpose of providing hotel accommodation for Europeans in India, China, and other places in the East.

A return which has just been made to the House of Commons on the motion of Mr. Hubbard, shows that no less than 297 joint-stock companies have been formed under the Limited Liability Act since the commencement of the present year. A large proportion of these undertakings have been located in Liverpool and Birkenhead. Early in January the British and Foreign Marine Insurance Company was registered as at Manchester-buildings, Tithebarn-street, with a nominal capital of £1,000,000; and on the same day the British and American Exchange Banking Corporation, at 18, Brown's-buildings, having also an office in the metropolis, with a similar amount of capital. A week later the Union Marine Insurance Company—offices at Liverpool and London Chambers, High-street—was started, with a nominal capital of two millions; and within another week this was followed by the Empire Marine Insurance Company, at the same place, with a capital of £1,000,000. Early in February came the Albion Marine Insurance Company, at Exchange-court, Exchange-street East, with a like amount of capital; and shortly afterwards the Merchantile and Exchange Bank, at 17, Brown's-buildings, also with a million of capital. Within a few days the National Bank of Liverpool, capital £1,000,000, was started at 1, Exchange-buildings; and this was followed, three days afterwards, by the Birkenhead Land and Investment Association, for advancing money on mortgage of lands, buildings, and personal property, buying and selling buildings, &c., at 26, Conway-street, Birkenhead, capital £10,000; and the River Plate Land and Farming Company, at 52, South Castle-street, capital £40,000, for carrying on the business of sheep and cattle farmers in one or more provinces of the Republic of Uruguay or of the Argentine Confederation. Early in March the Liverpool Land Company was registered, having its place of business at 18, Dale-street, and a nominal capital of £50,000, for dealing in lands and making improvements in the same; and a few days afterwards the Birkenhead Theatre Company, capital £10,000, at 11, Duncan-street, Birkenhead, for purchasing land and erecting a theatre thereon. There was then a brief suspension of enterprise, but early in April the Mercantile Marine Insurance Company was registered as at Manchester-buildings, Tithebarn-street, with a capital of half-a-million. Early in May the Salt Agency Company was formed, having its place of business at 22A, Preson's-row. No capital was subscribed in this case, but each member guaranteed £300 to meet expenses, in case of winding up. Two days later the London, Edinburgh, and Liverpool Insurance Company was formed, capital £2,000,000, for insurance business generally, whether fire, life, or marine, and the usual business of a guarantee and suretyship association. This was followed within a week by the Mersey River Steamboat Company, capital £20,000; and in another week by the North Docks Warehouse Company, capital £5,000, at 20, North John-street, for erecting and letting warehouses, and carrying on the business of warehousemen; and the Low Wood Gunpowder Company, capital £100,000, at 10, Orange-court, Castle-street, for purchasing the business of Messrs. Dyer, Barker, & Co., and manufacturing and selling gunpowder. On the 1st of June the County Palatine Loan and Discount Company was registered as at 5, Church-alley, capital £100,000; on the 3rd, the Liverpool Tobacco Warehouse Company, capital £100,000, for storing and manipulating tobacco and other merchandises in warehouses in Liverpool and Birkenhead on the 5th, the Union Loan and Dis-

count Company, capital £40,000, at 38, Renshaw-street; and on the 10th, the Erwfelin Lead Mining Company, capital £4,000, for working lead and other mines in Flintshire, but carrying on business at 8, Litherland-alley, Dale-street. These companies have been so recently formed that it cannot be stated whether they are still in operation, but none of them have given notice to the contrary. Since the date of the former return, however, the Liverpool Oil Crushing and Grinding Company has been abandoned.

COURT PAPERS.

ORDER IN CHANCERY.

Whereas it is proper that the accounts kept by the Accountant-General of this court should be examined and compared in order to settle the same; and whereas it will require considerable time to perfect such examination, and it is necessary that a time should be appointed for closing the books of accounts of the said Accountant-General for the purposes aforesaid: I do order that the books of the said Accountant-General be closed from and after Tuesday, the 18th day of August next, to Wednesday, the 28th day of October next, inclusive, excepting upon the days and for the purposes hereinafter mentioned, in order to adjust the accounts of the suitors with the books kept at the bank, and that during that time no draft for any money, except as hereinafter provided, or certificate for any effects under the care and direction of this Court, be signed or delivered out by the Accountant-General, or any stocks or annuities accepted or transferred by him relating to the suitors of this court; and that no purchase, sale, or transfer be made by the said Accountant-General unless the order or request or registrar's certificate be left at his office on or before Wednesday, the 5th day of August next, and that no order for payment of any money out of court which may be then in court be received in the Accountant-General's office after Friday, the 7th day of August next: Provided, nevertheless, that the office of the said Accountant-General shall be open on Thursday, the 15th, Friday, the 16th, and Saturday, the 17th days of October next, for the delivery out of any regular interest drafts which have become payable in respect of the October dividends, and of any other regular interest drafts which shall have become payable during the closing of the office as aforesaid. And to the end that the suitors may have notice hereof, and apply to the Court, as there shall be occasion, to have money paid to them out of the bank, or stocks, or annuities transferred to them before the 13th of August next, I do order that this order be entered and set up in the several offices of this Court.

(Signed) WESTBURY, C.

Court for Divorce and Matrimonial Causes.

The Right Hon. Stephen Lushington, Judge of the High Court of Admiralty of England, will sit for the Right Hon. the Judge Ordinary of her Majesty's Court for Divorce and Matrimonial Causes in chambers, on Friday, the 31st of July, 1863, at eleven o'clock, to hear summonses; and at twelve o'clock in court, on the said 31st of July, to hear motions.

Papers for motions must be left in the Registry on Monday, the 27th of July, 1863, before two o'clock.

Divorce Registry, July 21, 1863.

The shorthand writer of the House of Commons states in his evidence before the Select Committee on Private Bill Legislation that he receives two guineas a day for attendance before committees to take notes of the evidence, and 9d. per folio of 72 words for making a copy from his notes. Last year he received for business thus done for the committees on private bills £6,667, consisting of £1,684 for attendance fees and £4,983 for the transcripts; this does not include the charges in respect of committees on public matters. He is appointed for the House of Lords also. So much of the business as he cannot execute by his own establishment he transfers to other shorthand writers on rather lower terms, but he himself keeps a staff of ten shorthand writers. Each of these has at least one clerk who can read his shorthand, but the most efficient course is found to be that he have two such clerks, each of whom (and himself also), taking in hand a portion of the notes, dictates to quick writers, so that the mode of transcribing is by writing from dictation, and not by copying. There is a great strain and pressure in order to get the transcript to the law stationer's a time for the requisite number of copies to be ready when the committee meet next morning. In the height of the season,

the witness mentions, he provides refreshments for about 50 persons employed at his office during the evening, many of them until midnight, and often later.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

CAIRNS—On July 17, at 79, Eaton-place, Lady Cairns, of a son.
NORMAN—On July 20, at 12a, Upper Woburn-place, the wife of W. Norman, Esq., Conveyancer, of a son.
SHERVINGTON—On June 15, at St. George's, Grenada, West Indies, the wife of the Hon. Tyrrell Mildmay Sherrington, H.M.'s Attorney-General, prematurely, of a daughter, stillborn.

MARRIAGES.

FOSTER—DRURY—On July 16, at St. Mary-le-Wigford, Lincoln, Charles Millett Foster, of North Curry, Somerset, Solicitor, to Helen Jane, second daughter of the late Mr. James Drury, of that city.
MUSSON—CHAPMAN—On June 4, at Barbadoes, Samuel James Musson, Esq., to Martha Elizabeth, eldest daughter of Peter Chapman, Esq., Solicitor.

DEATHS.

CUVELJE—On July 15, at Poplar, in the 61st year of her age, Sarah, widow of the late Thomas Cuvelje, Esq., of Southampton-buildings, Chancery-lane, and Frogmal, Hampstead.
TUCKER—On July 16, at Chard, William Henry Tucker, Esq., Solicitor, of Dulverton, aged 28.
WILLIAMS—On July 14, Frederick Sims Williams, of Hill-side, Blackheath, and Lincoln's-inn, Barrister-at-Law, aged 31.

HEIRS AT LAW AND NEXT OF KIN.

(Advertised in the London Gazette).

HOWES, DANIEL, 18, Bernersday New-road, Surrey, Boot Maker. Next of kin. Howes v. Howes, M.K. Aug 4.

ESTATE EXCHANGE REPORT.

AT THE MART.

By Mr. TOOTELL.

Freehold, Brook Farm, situate in the parishes of Marden and Yalding, Kent, comprising residence, farm buildings, &c., and four labourers' cottages and about 234 acres of land.—Sold for £11,250.

By Messrs. DANIEL SMITH, SON, & OAKLEY.
Freehold, The Beech House Estate, near Christchurch, Southampton, comprising mansion, and domain of about 432 acres.—Sold for £12,500.

By Mr. MOORELL.

Leasehold, four houses, Stebbondale-street, Cubitt-town, Poplar.—Sold for £640.

By Messrs. NORTON, HOGGART, & TAYLOR.

Freehold, Wandsworth Lodge, Wandsworth, Surrey, comprising residence, stables, &c., and about 18 acres of land.—Sold for £12,500.

Freehold plot of building land, 2a. 3r. 3p., at Wandsworth.—Sold for £1,200.

Freehold plot of building land, 1a. 1r. 36p., at Wandsworth.—Sold for £1,200.

Freehold plot of building land, 5a. 0r. 4p., at Wandsworth.—Sold for £2,000.

Freehold plot of building land, 2a. 3r. 34p., at Wandsworth.—Sold for £3,150.

Leasehold plot of building land, 23a. 0r. 25p., at Wandsworth.—Sold for £420.

By Messrs. WILKINSON & HORNE.

Leasehold residence, No. 20, Delamere-terrace, Paddington.—Sold for £350.

Leasehold residence, No. 21, Delamere-terrace.—Sold for £300.

Leasehold residence, No. 3, Cornwall-terrace, Paddington.—Sold for £300.

Leasehold residence, No. 6, Cornwall-terrace, Paddington.—Sold for £600.

Leasehold house and shop, No. 12, Chichester-street, Paddington.—Sold for £600.

AT GARRAWAY'S.

By Messrs. FAREBROTHER, CLARK, & LYE.

Freehold residential estate, known as "Finchcocks," near to Lambhurst, Kent, comprising mansion, farm buildings, &c., and about 344 acres land.—Sold for £27,000.

Freehold, Holden House Estate, Loughborough-common, Kent, comprising mansion and about 68 acres of land.—Sold for £8,750.

By Messrs. BLAKE.

Freehold residence, Stroud House, Woodside, Croydon, and about 13 acres land.—Sold for £6,020.

By Mr. G. A. BROWN.

Leasehold public-house and seven houses and shops, Queen-street, and London-street, Ratcliff.—Sold for £1,000.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

TUESDAY, July 21, 1863.

Growse, Robert, & John P. Shorter, Hastings, Solicitors (Growse & Shorter). July 1. By mutual consent.

Holloway, R. H., & Henry Harrod, Fawcay and Marlborough, Solicitors. July 6. By mutual consent.

Windings-up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, July 17, 1863.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Consols Insurance Association.—The Master of the Rolls will, on July 27, at twelve, proceed to make a call on all the persons who have been settled in Class A of the list of contributors of this Association for one pound per share.

North Wheal Exmouth Mining Company.—The Master of the Rolls will, on July 29, at 1.30, proceed to make a call on the several persons who are settled on the list of contributors of this Company for twelve shillings per share.

THURSDAY, July 21, 1863.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Chesterfield New Dunston Colliery Company (Limited).—The Master of the Rolls has fixed July 29, at 12, for the appointment of an Official Liquidator of this Company.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Great Western Coal Company.—Vice-Chancellor Kindersley will, on Aug 3, at 12, proceed to make a further call on the contributors of this Company for six pounds per share.

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claims.

FRIDAY, July 17, 1863.

Andrews, John, Ipswich, Butcher. Aug 3. Aldous, Ipswich.
Attree, Thos, Queen's-park, Brighton, Esq. Sept 12. Attree & Co, Brighton.
Austen, Hy, Brencley, Kent, Farmer. Sept 14. Depree & Austen, Lawrence-lane, Chesham.
Cullen, Wm, Barrestone, Kent, Gent. Aug 24. Claris, Dover.
Dentith, Samuel, Manch, Innkeeper. Aug 20. Higson & Robinson, Manch.
Griffith, John Griffith, Llanfair Hall, Carnarvon, Esq. Sept 29. Burne, Carey-street, Lincoln's-inn.
Haynes, Wm, Fore-st, London, Saddler. Sept 1. Atkinson, Watling-st.
Jones, John Foulkes, Breadenhead, Salop, Gent. Sept 15. Randles, Eilesmere.
Kilgour, Eliza Rawling, Monnair de Bas, Guernsey, Widow. Aug 31. Heath, Warwick.
Lloyd, Morris, Pale, Merioneth, Esq. Sept 1. Minshall, Oswestry.
Lloyd, Thos, Cambrol, Llandidlo, Montgomery, Farmer. Aug 1. Minshall, Oswestry.
Miles, Lawford Edw, Island of Heligoland, Esq. Sept 10. Clarke, Bristol.
Napper, Hy, Dorking, Farmer. Aug 20. Hart & Hart, Dorking.
Parritt, Wm, Alveston, Warwick, Carpenter. Sept 10. Slatter, for Hobbs & Slatter, Stratford-upon-Avon.
Plumptre, Rev Hy Scawen, Kennington. Aug 31. Shaw & Roscoe, Bedford-row.
Robinson, Geo Edw, Founders-ct, Lothbury, Stock Jobber. Aug 11. Upward, Copthall-ct, Throgmorton-st.
Robinson, Wm, Margate, China Dealer. Sept 23. Brooke & Hughes, Margate.
Russell, Wm, Wingfield Bank, Northfleet, Esq. Sept 29. Russell & Sons, Queen-st, Chesham.
Westrop, Frances, Backland, Dover, Widow. Aug 24. Claris, Dover.

TUESDAY, July 21, 1863.

Archer, Hy, Gloucester-st, Pimlico, Esq. Sept 20. Norris, Chancery-lane.
Blisset, Mary, St John's-wood-terrace, Regent's-park, Widow. Oct 1. Finch, Doleys-hill, Kilburn.
Casement, Hugh, Melbourne, Colony of Victoria. Aug 15. Lawrence & Co, Old Jewry-chambers.
Charlton, Sarah, Sarah-pl, Brook-green-lane, Hammersmith, Widow. Aug 20. Shephard, Moorgate-st.
Coster, Jas, Cornwall-villas, Willis-rd, Kentish Town, Esq. Aug 7. Swan, St Knight-ridge-st, Doctors'-commons.
Ferguson, Joseph, Morton, St Mary, Cumberland, Esq. Aug 29. Saul, Carlisle.
Instone, Edw, Bourton, nr Mach Wenlock, Salop, Farmer. Sept 1. Cooper, Bridgnorth.
Jackson, John, Ererton, Gent. Sept 1. Norris & Sons, Lpool.
Martin, Thos Balmforth, Holmfirth, York, Assistant Surgeon to Her Majesty's Ship Racer. Aug 17. Kidd & Jessop, Holmfirth.
Nicholas, Jas, St Leonard's-on-the-Sea, Builder. Sept 14. Young, Hastings.
Stables, John, Wilderness, Ascot Heath, Gent. Sept 4. Loaden, Bedford-pl, Russell-sq.
Western, John, Plymouth, Gent. Sept 1. Gidley, Plymouth.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, July 17, 1863.

Colbatch, John, Brighton, Gent. Nov 4. Colbatch v. Onions, M. R.
Daubney, Joseph, Great Grimaby, Gent. Oct 29. Daubney v. Daubney, V. C. Wood.
Howe, Daniel, Bermondsey New-rd, Boot Maker. Aug 4. Howe v. Howe, M. R.
Pattie, Daniel, Clarence-rd, Seven Sisters-rd, Holloway, Victualler. Oct 31. Pattie v. Stewart, V. C. Stuart.

TUESDAY, July 21, 1863.

Bickley, Benj, Clifton, Gloucester, Esq. Nov 5. Bickley v. Bickley, M. R.
Eates, Edw, Cosford, Warwick, Farmer. Nov 2. Bates v. Bates, V. C. Kindersley.
Clare, Ambrose, Size-lane, London, Attorney-at-Law. Nov 3. Pringle v. Bourne, M. R.
Gully, John, Cochen-hall, Durham, Esq. Nov 5. Gully v. Gully, M. R.
Jones, John, Worship-st, Norton Folgate, Veterinary Surgeon. Nov 4. Jones v. Jones, V. C. Stuart.
Lapfield, Wm, Cranbourne-st, Leicester-sq, Publican. Nov 2. Dawson v. Lapfield, V. C. Stuart.

Assignments for Benefit of Creditors.

TUESDAY, July 21, 1863.

Harris, Wm, Lincoln's-inn-fields, Gent. July 7. Harris, Rugby.

Deeds registered pursuant to Bankruptcy Act, 1861.

FRIDAY, July 17, 1863.

Barter, Jonathan, Ratrick, York, Hide Broker. June 16. Asst. Reg July 14.
Blackstone, Alan Cornwall, Henrietta-st, Covent-garden, Clerk in the Board of Works. July 6. Asst. Reg July 16.
Blund, Henry, Shales Hall, Sheffield, Butcher. July 3. Conv. Reg July 14.
Cuttis, Robt, Banford, Notts, Haberdasher. July 7. Conv. Reg July 15.

Donald, Robt, Goldworth, nr Woking, Surrey, Nurseryman. June 19. Asst. Reg July 16.

Geesling, Hy, Cranborne, Dorset, Grocer. June 15. Asst. Reg July 13.
Griffith, Jas, Cardiff, Auctioneer. June 17. Conv. Reg July 14.
Howard, John, Birkenhead, Music Dealer. June 25. Asst. Reg July 17.

Hunt, John Wm, York Town, Frintley, Surrey, Victualler. June 16. Comp. Reg July 14.

Jones, Chas Merriman, Archibut-ter, Chelsea, Gent. June 20. Comp. Reg July 16.

Marks, John, Fort-st, Spital-sq, Middlesex, Clothier. July 11. Comp. Reg July 15.

Orr, Matthew, St Dunstan's-ct, Fleet-st, Newspaper Proprietor. July 13. Comp. Reg July 15.

Robbins, John, Manch, Baker. July 7. Comp. Reg July 17.

Saph, John, Strand, swansea, Plumber. July 1. Conv. Reg July 17.

Smyth, Joseph Miles, Lpool, Bookseller. June 17. Conv. Reg July 15.

Stephenson, Benj, Cleethorpes, Lincoln, Fisherman. June 17. Asst. Reg July 15.

Taylor, Joanna Boosey, Sudbury, Suffolk, Plumber. June 29. Conv. Reg July 15.

Tollerton, Wm Nicholson, Lincoln, Photographer. June 16. Comp. Reg July 15.

Whitall, John, & Matthew Elliott, High Holborn, Woollen Drapers. June 22. Asst. Reg July 16.

Wright, Chas Fredk, Manch, Grocer. June 17. Asst. Reg July 15.

TUESDAY, July 21, 1863.

Bailey, Margaret, Manch, Brazier. June 26. Asst. Reg July 18.

Baldwin, Joseph Southill, Halifax, Chemist and Druggist. June 20. Conv. Reg July 18.

Bolton, Wm Geo Fredk, Stratford-upon-Avon, Hotel Keeper. June 23. Asst. Reg July 18.

Carte, Chas, Ticknall, Derby, Linen Draper. June 25. Conv. Reg July 20.

Cawood, Augustus Joseph, Cardigan, Attorney's Clerk. June 25. Asst. Reg July 20.

Coghlan, Joseph, Bradford, Stuff Merchant. June 30. Conv. Reg July 20.

Davies, John, Barleymow, Carmarthen, Victualler. July 4. Asst. Reg July 20.

Duckworth, Jas, New Accrington, Heald Knitter. June 23. Asst. Reg July 20.

Hancock, Jas, Manch, Timber Merchant. June 20. Asst. Reg July 17.

Herrier, Robt John, Cold Harbour-lane, Camberwell, Government Clerk. July 15. Asst. Reg July 17.

Howarth, Chas, Somerford-grove, Stoke Newington. July 9. Conv. Reg July 17.

Jackson, Joseph, Marple, Chester, Tailor. July 17. Release. Reg July 20.

Keogh, Joseph, Bolton, Confectioner. June 23. Conv. Reg July 20.

Lazarus, Moses, Bernard-st, Russell-sq, Jeweller. July 8. Comp. Reg July 17.

Lewis, Benj, Swansea, Builder. June 27. Conv. Reg July 20.

Lewis, Rees, Cardiff, Outfitter. June 23. Asst. Reg July 18.

Linton, John Pedron, Raithwaite, Newholm-cum-Dunsley, York, Auctioneer. June 29. Conv. Reg July 20.

Naylor, John, Birm, General Brassfounder. June 23. Asst. Reg July 17.

Nicholls, John, Saitley, Aston-juxta-Birm, Butcher. July 13. Comp. Reg July 18.

Peck, Thos, Manch, Builder. July 15. Comp. Reg July 17.

Rodrick, Thos, Melnallch Factory, Cwmaw, Ystradgynlais, Brecon, Woollen Manufacturer. July 17. Conv. Reg July 18.

Shaw, Rodger, Halthwaite, Northumberland, Grocer. June 27. Comp. Reg July 18.

Smith, Hy John, King's Lynn, Tailor. June 22. Asst. Reg July 18.

Sparkes, Geo, Hereford, Tailor. June 17. Comp. Reg July 15.

Thomson, Fredk Octavius, Bartlett's-buildings, Holborn, Cabinet Manufacturer. June 30. Conv. Reg July 20.

Wagstaff, Jas Richd, Pembroke-street, Caledonian-rd, out of business. July 17. Conv. Reg July 20.

Willcox, John Pearson, Princes End Stafford, and Wm Cartwright, Dudley Port, Chartermaster. July 14. Comp. Reg July 20.

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, July 17, 1863.

To Surrender in London.

Appleyard, Wm Benj, Foot's Cray, Kent, Grocer. Pet July 15. Adg 4 at 11. Buchanan, Basinghall-st.

Baillie, Jas Mills, & Gustavus Dunsley, Gt St Helen's, Bishopgate-st within, Merchants. Pet July 4. Aug 1 at 1. Sole & Co, Alderman-bury.

Callow, Edward, St Paul's-grove, Ball's-pond, out of business. Pet July 13. July 25 at 2. Wetherfield, Moorgate-st.

Church, Daniel, Buxton-ct, Spitalfields, Chemist. Pet July 15. Aug 4 at 1. Ingle, King William-st, City.

Cox, Wm, Venetian-cottage, Spencer-pl, Brixton-rd, Carpenter. Pet July 15. Aug 4 at 11. Ody, Trinity-st, Southwark.

Gardener, Frances Edith (and not Francis Edith Gardener, as previously advertised).

Garner, Geo, Thames-st, Kingston, Fancy Stationer. Pet July 11. Aug 1 at 12. Drew, New Basinghall-st.

Hadley, John, Amelia-pl, Walworth, Baker. Pet July 13. Aug 1 at 12. Sydney & Son, Finsbury-circus.

Hays, Jas Silvester, Gravel-lane, Southwark, Victualler. Pet July 14. Aug 1 at 1. Foord, Pinner's-hall, Old Broad-st.

James, Rebecca, Gravesend, Victualler. Adj July 14. Aug 1 at 1. Aldridge.

Lawrence, Wm, Beaufort-st, Chelsea, Commercial Traveller. Pet July 14. Aug 4 at 11. Murrough, Warwick-ct, Gray's-inn.

Leeson, John, Braunston, Northampton, Builder. Adj June 11. July 28 at 2. Aldridge.

Maskell, Jas Hy, Liverpool-st, King's-cross, out of business. Pet July 14. July 28 at 2. King & McMillin, Bloomsbury-sq.

Meredith, Jas, Salisbury-st, Portman-market, Middx, out of business. Pet July 13. July 28 at 2. Marshall & Son, Hatton-garden.

Morris, John Griffiths, Northampton, Commercial Traveller. Pet July 13. Aug 1 at 12. Williams, Lawrence-lane.

Onslow, Geo, Willow-pl, St Peter's-rd, Mile-end, Commercial Traveller. Pet July 12. July 28 at 2. Hill, Basinghall-st.

Phillips, John, City-rd, Fur Bag Manufacturer. Pet July 13. Aug 1 at 1. Ferdydy, Bedford-row.

Roberts, John Robt, Borough-market, Victualler. Pet July 15. Aug 4 at 11. Farmer, Seize-lane.
Rose, Robert Glanville, Fenchurch-st. Adj July 14. Aug 4 at 11. Aldridge.
Taylor, Hy, Lupton, Belgrave, Middx, out of business. Pet July 10. Aug 11 at 11. Riches, Coleman-st.
Waller, Edward Augustus, Cambridge-ter, nr All Saints' Church, Baywater, Comm Agent. Pet July 9 (for pan). July 28 at 2. Aldridge.

To Surrender in the Country.

Andrew, Jas, Tawstock, Devon, Miller. Pet July 10. Exeter, July 31 at 12. Terrell, Exeter.
Appleton, George, Warrington, Lancashire, File Smith. Pet July 2. Warrington, July 30 at 12. Day, Warrington.
Bakewell, Hy, Nethells, Birm, Land and Estate Agent (for pan). Pet July 6. Birm, Aug 4 at 10.
Barnes, Geo, Bedford, Grocer. Pet July 13. Bedford, July 27 at 10. Scott, Staple-inn, London.
Bate, John, Birm, Provision Dealer. Pet July 6 (for pan). Birm, Aug 4 at 10.

Beardshaw, John, York, Publican. Pet July 14. Sheffield, Aug 5 at 2. Broadbent, Sheffield.
Birkett, Jacob, Lpool, Comm Agent. Adj June 17. Lpool, July 28 at 3. Evans & Co, Lpool.
Brown, Joseph, Jun, Wombidge, Salop, Victualler. Pet July 10. Wellington, Aug 7 at 10. James, Wellington.
Bull, Thos Stephens, Stroud, Clifton, Gloucester, Mason. Pet July 11. Stroud, July 35 at 11. Clutterbuck, Stroud.
Caddick, Richd, Westbromwich, Attorney. Pet July 14. Birm, July 31 at 12. James & Co, Birm; Round, Tipton; and Bayley, Westbromwich.

Clarke, Wm, Lpool, out of business. Adj July 13. Lpool, July 28 at 11. Collard, Wm Hy, Brighton, Painter. Pet July 14. Brighton, Aug 6 at 11. Goodman, Brighton.
Cox, Saml, Cheltenham, Teacher of Music. Pet July 15. Bristol, July 31 at 11. Marshall, Cheltenham, and Abbott & Co, Bristol.
Conliss, Edw, Birm, Provision Dealer. Pet July 6 (for pan). Birm, Aug 4 at 10.
Darrall, John, Deepfields, nr Bilton, Grocer. Adj July 14. Birm, Aug 3 at 12.

Douglas, Benj, Lpool, Provision Dealer. Adj July 13. Lpool, July 28 at 12.
Earnshaw, Joseph, Stannington, nr Sheffield, Farmer. Pet June 5 (for pan). Sheffield, Aug 5 at 2. Mason, York and Sheffield.
Edmonds, John, Hanley Castle, nr Upton-upon-Severn, Shoemaker. Pet July 6. Upton-upon-Severn, Aug 6 at 12. Bentley, Worcester.
Edwards, Edward, Willenhall, Stafford, Beerhouse Keeper. Pet. Wolverhampton, Aug 4 at 12. Cresswell, Wolverhampton.
Evans, Wm, Finchfield, Tottenham, Stafford, Gun-lock Filer. Pet. Wolverhampton, Aug 4 at 12. Stratton, Wolverhampton.

Fowler, Stephen, Jun, Benham, nr Newbury, Berks, Farmer. Pet July 13. Newbury, July 28 at 11. Astley, Hungerford.
Fuller, Mary Ann, Swansea, out of business. Pet July 14. Swansea, Aug 5 at 3. Morris, Swansea.
Gee, Joseph, Lincoln, Sewing Machine Manufacturer. Pet July 13. Lincoln, July 29 at 11. Brown & Son, Lincoln.
Gunn, Fredk John, Newnham, Gloucester, Chemist. Pet June 19. Exeter, Aug 5 at 1. Carter & Gould, Newnham, and Clarke, Exeter.

Hamilton, Esther, Ripon, York, Farmer. Pet July 7 (for pan). Ripon, Aug 7 at 12. Mason, York and Sheffield.
Hamilton, Pybus, Ripon, York, Farmer. Pet July 7 (for pan). Ripon, Aug 7 at 12. Mason, York and Sheffield.
Heginbotham, John, Fernilee, Derby, Ironmonger. Pet July 4. Manch, Aug 10 at 12. Fox, Manch.
Henderson, Matthew, Old Shildon, Durham, Grocer. Pet July 13. Bishop Auckland, Aug 6 at 10. Thornton, Bishop Auckland.

Horrocks, Joseph, Horton, Bradford, Pickier Maker. Pet July 14. Bradford, Aug 11 at 10.30. Yewdall, Bradford.
Jackson, John, Oakham, Rutland, Innkeeper. Adj April 15. Oakham, Aug 12 at 2. Hazby, Leicester.
James, Edwin, Upton, Berks, Blacksmith. Pet July 9. Wallingford, July 30 at 11. Smith, Reading.
Lambert, Geo Edwin, Bilton, Chain Manufacturer. Pet July 13. Birm, July 31 at 12. Round, Tipton, and James & Co, Birm.
Lawton, Ellish, Burslem, Stafford, Cabinet Maker. Pet July 14. Hanley, Aug 15 at 12. Sutton, Burslem.

Laycock, Thomas, Brotherton, nr Pontefract, York, Cattle Dealer. Pet July 3 (for pan). Pontefract, July 29 at 11. Mason, York and Sheffield.
Leggett, Hy, Gorleston, Suffolk, Fisherman. Pet July 10. Great Yarmouth, Aug 7 at 12. Cufaude, Great Yarmouth.
Marshall, Richd, Middlesborough, York, Shoe Dealer. Pet July 7 (for pan). Stockton-on-Tees, July 28 at 11. Mason, York and Sheffield.
Mellor, Wm Hy, Lpool, Brewer. Pet July 9. Lpool, July 31 at 11. Haigh & Deane, Lpool.
Neeson, Chas, Boot Maker, Manch. Adj Nov 19, 1861. Manch, Aug 13 at 12. Gardner, Manch.

Miller, Philip Robertson, Birm, Comm Agent. Pet July 10 (for pan). Birm, July 31 at 12.
Minton, Geo, Hanbury, Stafford, Coachman. Pet July 11. Burton, Aug 8 at 1. Bagshaw, Uttoxeter.
Newman, Edw Thos, Bognor, Sussex, Plumber. Pet July 13. Chichester, July 29 at 11. Goodman, Brighton.
Partridge, Jas Edw, Westbromwich, Brass Founder. Pet July 15. Birm, Aug 3 at 12. Smith, Birm.
Pitt, Joseph, Jun, All Saints, Worcester, Cooper. Pet July 4. Worcester, July 20 at 11. Wilson, Worcester.

Rice, Thos, Lpool, Dealer in Old Metal. Adj July 13. Lpool, July 28 at 11. Richardson, Wm, Shalstone, Buckingham, Farmer. Pet. Buckingham, July 29 at 11. Small, Buckingham.
Scott, Wm, Millhouse, Castleworkby, Cumberland, Blacksmith. Pet July 15. Penrith, July 31 at 10. Arnison, Penrith.
Sergeant, John, Lpool, Timber Dealer. Adj July 13. Lpool, July 28 at 12. Shackleton, Geo, Leeds, Corn Dealer. Pet July 4. Leeds, Aug 3 at 11.30. Robinson, Skipton, and Bond & Harwick, Leeds.
Shelley, Edw, Wolverhampton, Comm Agent. Pet July 13. Birm, Aug 4 at 12. Round, Tipton, and James & Co, Birm.
Shelley, Edw Shaw, Bilton, Chemist. Pet July 15. Birm, July 31 at 12. Round, Tipton, and James & Co, Birm.

Shelley, John Burton, Bilton, Chemist. Pet July 15. Birm, Aug 3 at 12. Round, Tipton, and James & Co, Birm.
Smith, Samuel, Everton, Lpool, Grocer. Adj July 13. Lpool, July 28 at 11.11.
St Clair, Geo Horatio, Birm, Auctioneer. Pet July 6 (for pan). Aug 4 at 10.
Starmer, Thos, Collyhurst, Manch, Boot Maker. Pet July 13. Manch, Aug 24 at 9.30. Swan, Manchester.
Townsend, Saml, Leicester, Dealer in Wood. Pet July 14. Nottingham, July 29 at 11. Law, Stamford.

Tune, Thos, Winterton, Lincoln, Carrier. Pet July 14. Kingston-upon-Hull, Aug 5 at 12. Pottsgill, Hull.
Ward, Wm, Dale-end, Birm, Victualler. Pet July 6. Birm, July 27 at 12. Hodgson & Co, Birm.
Watson, Geo Boti Churchill, Chester, M.D. Pet July 13. Lpool, July 28 at 11. Cartwright, Chester.
Westlake, John Martin, Brisworthy, Devon, Cattle Dealer. Pet July 13. Exeter, July 31 at 12. Bridgman, Tavistock, and Hirtzel, Exeter.
Wright, Wm Hy, Chudleigh, Devon, Malster. Pet July 6. Exeter, Aug 5 at 12. Pitt, Exeter.

Young, Saml, Hulme, Furniture Broker. Pet July 13. Salford, Aug 1 at 9.30. Atkins, Manch.

TUESDAY, July 21, 1863.

To Surrender in London.

Ansonbe, Matilda, St Ann's-st, Westminster, out of employ. Pet July 16 (for pan). Aug 4 at 12. Aldridge.
Beard, Francis Carr, Welbeck-st, Cavendish-sq, Surgeon. Pet July 13. Aug 4 at 2. Lawrence & Co, Old Jewry-chambers.
Boyle, Richd, Newington-pl, Stoke Newington, out of business. Pet July 16 (for pan). Aug 4 at 1. Aldridge.
Clark, John, Victoria-ter, Lower-rl, Rotherhithe, Baker. Pet July 18. Aug 4 at 2. Chidley, Old Jewry.

Cooper, Chas, Woodfield's-villa, Hurstpierpoint, Sussex, Colonel. Pet July 18. Aug 4 at 2. Head & Pattison, Martin's-lane, Cannon-st.
Cronin, Patrick, Bermudez-st, Southwark, Tailor. Pet July 16. Aug 4 at 12. Hill, Basinghall-st.
Fairbairn, John Hy, Rochester, Seedman. Pet July 16. Aug 4 at 2. Harrison & Lewis, Old Jewry.
Fearnley, Geo, Camden-row, Camden Town, Coffee-house Keeper. Pet July 16. Aug 4 at 11. Heydon, Serio-st, Lincoln's-lan.

Frankland, John Benj, Brunswick-st, Keston-rd, St Pancras, Olman. Pet July 16. Aug 4 at 1. Marshall, Lincoln's-lan.
Gurney, Geo, Rotherfield-st, Lower-rl, Islington, out of business. Pet. July 16 (for pan). Aug 4 at 1. Aldridge.
Hills, Chas, West-st, Gravesend, Farmer. Pet July 17. Aug 4 at 1. Nickoll, Backersbury.
Johnson, John, Brick-lane, Spitalfields, Builder. Pet July 17 (for pan). Aug 4 at 1. Aldridge.
Keymer, Geo Sandford, Claremont-cottages, Cornwall-pl, Holloway, Wine Gauger. Pet July 16 (for pan). Aug 4 at 1. Aldridge.

Kieran, Charlotte Clara, Brook-st, Bond-st, of no business. Pet July 16 (for pan). Aug 4 at 1. Aldridge.
Lambert, John Wm, Clifton-st, Shepherd's-bush, Bricklayer. Pet July 16. Aug 4 at 12. Rice & Mason, Quality-ch, Chancery-lane.
Meakes, Wm Squire, Try-cottage, Battersea, Horse Dealer. Pet July 16 (for pan). Aug 4 at 12. Aldridge.
Olson, Christian, St George-st, St George's-in-the-East, Lodging-house Keeper. Pet July 13. Aug 4 at 12. Beard, Basinghall-st.
Ott, Wm, York-pl, Walworth-rd, Painter. Pet July 18. Aug 4 at 2. Silvester, Gt Dover-st, Newington.

Pear, John, Strand, Wig Maker. Pet July 16 (for pan). Aug 4 at 12. Aldridge.
Phillips, Wm Augustus, Wildermere-row, Clerkenwell, Pewterer. Pet July 16. Aug 4 at 12. Buchanan, Basinghall-st.
Rawlins, Thos, Deptford, Baker. Pet July 13. Aug 4 at 1. Marshall, Basinghall-st.
Roberts, John Wm, Thistle-grove-lane, Old Brompton, Dealer in Beer. Pet July 15. Aug 4 at 2. Beard, Basinghall-st.
Russell, Edw Wells, Lambeth-walk, Manager of a Beerhouse. Pet July 15. Aug 4 at 3. Peverley, Coleman-st.

Sewell, John, Nicholas-lane, Iron Merchant. Pet July 15. Aug 4 at 1. Linklaters & Hatched, Walbrook.
Smith, John Bennett, Grosvenor-cottages, Grosvenor-rd, Stockwell, Teacher of Music. Pet July 13. Aug 4 at 12. Hall, Coleman-st.
Spencer, Alf, Hare-st, Bethnal-green, Clothier. Pet July 17. Aug 4 at 3. Abbott, Mark's-st, Gt Prescott-st.
Swan, Chas, Watling-st, Comm Agent. Pet July 13. Aug 4 at 2. Leopard & Gammon, Cloak-lane.
Tomlyn, John, Blue Town, Sheerness, out of business. Pet July 16. Aug 4 at 12. Hare, Basinghall-st.

Wood, Arabella Eliza, Redcliffe-rd, West Brompton, Governess. Pet July 16 (for pan). Aug 4 at 12. Aldridge.
Woodward, Catharine, Redcliffe-rd, West Brompton, Schoolmistress. Pet July 16 (for pan). Aug 4 at 12. Aldridge.
To Surrender in the Country.
Addy, Edmond, Sheffield, Traveller. Pet July 17. Sheffield, Aug 5 at 2. Broadbent, Sheffield.

Akers, Sarah, Hockley, Birm, out of business. Pet July 15. Birm, Aug 4 at 10. Parry, Birm.
Andrews, Saml, Southampton, Dealer in Fish. Pet July 18. Southampton, Aug 12 at 12. Mackay, Southampton.
Arnold, Richd, Yardley Wood, Yardley, Worcester, Farmer. Pet July 16. Birm, Aug 3 at 12. James & Co, Birm.
Arrowsmith, Chas Wm, Bishopwearmouth, Tinsmith Merchant's Clerk. Pet July 13. Sandring, Aug 4 at 12. Hanson & Son, Sunderland.
Bailey, Geo, Lincoln, Ketchup Manufacturer. Adj July 9. Spalding, Aug 4 at 10. Bonner, Spalding.

Ball, Richd, Hastings, Wheelwright. Pet June 29 (for pan). Leam, July 29 at 11. Goodman, Brighton.
Benson, John, Dalton, York, Pinn Drawer. Pet July 14. Huddersfield, Aug 6 at 10. Sykes, Huddersfield.
Berens, August Philip, Lpool, Comm Merchant. Adj July 13. Lpool, Aug 3 at 11. Morgan, Lpool.
Birks, Saml, Fenton, Stafford, Butcher. Adj July 14. Stoke-upon-Trent, Aug 11. Litchfield, Newcastle.
Bond, Richd, Foulton-st, Ryde, Lancaster, Butcher. Adj July 13. Lpool, Aug 3 at 11.

Booth, Thos Beard, Stourbridge, Worcester, Baker. Pet July 17. Stourbridge, Aug 7 at 10. Maltby, Dudley, and Stourbridge.

Bousfield, Cutbert, Barnard Castle, Durham, Saddler. Pet July 17. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Aug 5 at 12.30. Story, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Cox, Wm, Northampton, Furniture Dealer. Pet July 16. Northampton, Aug 8 at 10. Shield & White, Northampton.

Crossland, Andrew, Kingston-upon-Hull, Victualler. Pet July 4. Kingston-upon-Hull, Aug 5 at 12. Eaton & Bellby, Hull.

Daniell, David, Portsea, Retailer of Beer. Pet July 15. Portsmouth, July 31 at 11. Pafford, Portsea.

Davis, Danl, Preston-on-Stour, Gloucester, Baker. Pet July 18. Bristol, July 31 at 11. Hicks, Warwick, Durham, Grocer. Pet July 17. Southhampton, Aug 19 at 12. Mackey, Southhampton.

Day, Geo Wilson, Southam, Southam, Bricklayer. Pet July 15. Southam, Aug 19 at 12. Mackey, Southam.

Deason, Thos, Dalton, Furness, Blacksmith. Pet June 22. Ulverston, July 27 at 11.30. Relph, Ulverston.

Dillon, Chas, Lpool, Tallow Chandler. Pet July 17. Lpool, July 31 at 3. Henry, Lpool.

Dotterill, John, Forton, Alverstoke, Southampton, Brewer. Pet July 15. Portsmouth, July 31 at 11. Way, Portsea.

Elliott, Wm, South Shields, Durham, Grocer. Pet July 17. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Aug 5 at 12. Story, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Evans, Thos, Bewdley, Haulier. Pet July 14. Kidderminster, Aug 19 at 10. Burbury, Stourbridge and Bewdley.

Farrall, Peter John, Birm, Machinist. Pet July 16. Birm, Aug 4 at 10. Parry, Birm.

Goodaker, Saml, sen, Birm, Baker. Pet July 16. Birm, Aug 3 at 12. Parry, Birm.

Guttery, Jas, Kidderminster, Cooper. Pet July 15. Kidderminster, Aug 19 at 10. Boycott, Kidderminster.

Harders, Jas, Dudley, Grocer. Pet July 16. Birm, July 31 at 12. Warrington, Dudley.

Haywood, Frederick, Blackpool, General Dealer. Adj July 15. Lpool, Aug 3 at 11.

Holmes, John, Ashby-de-la-Zouch, Leicester, Publican. Pet July 18. Ashby-de-la-Zouch, Aug 3 at 11. Dewes, Ashby-de-la-Zouch.

Holt, Thos, Little Bolton, Draper. Pet July 16. Bolton, Aug 10 at 10. Edge, Bolton.

Hudson, Jas, Bradford, Cloth Manufacturer. Pet July 16. Leeds, July 31 at 11. Scatchard, Morley, and Bond & Barwick, Leeds.

Jenkins, Alf, Kilkote, Gloucester, Horse Dealer. Pet July 16. Newent, July 31 at 12. Wilkes, Gloucester.

Jennings, John, Bradford, Butcher. Pet July 17. Bradford, Aug 11 at 10.30. Green, Bradford.

Jones, Thos, Scruton, nr Bedale, York, Dealer in Potatoes. Pet July 14. Northallerton, Aug 1 at 10. Harle, Leeds.

Kelly, Geo Lewis, Bootle, Clerk. Pet July 17. Lpool, July 31 at 3. Henry, Lpool.

Keighley, Benj, Leeds, Provision Dealer. Pet July 7 (for pau). Leeds, Aug 13 at 12. Simpson, Leeds.

King, John, Leeds, Watchmaker. Pet July 11. Leeds, Aug 13 at 12. Harle, Leeds.

Kirby, John, Longlight, nr Manchester, Beerseller. Pet July 8. Manch, July 31 at 11. Cobbett & Wheeler, Manch.

Lewis, Frederic, Westbromwich, Surgeon. Pet July 16. Oldbury, Aug 10 at 10. Hooper & North, Westbromwich.

Lock, Jas, Bexhill, Farm Labourer. Pet July 7 (for pau). Lewes, July 29 at 11. Goodman, Brighton.

Lowman, Edward, Portland, Dorset, Horsekeeper. Adj July 13. Exeter, Aug 7 at 11. Flood, Exeter.

Lucas, Chas, Lockhampton, Gloucester, Stonemason. Pet July 16. Cheltenham, Aug 4 at 11. Williams, Cheltenham.

McVea, Edward, Ulverston, Lancaster, Printer, &c. Pet June 22. Ulverston, July 27 at 11.30. Park, Ulverston.

Neal, Wm Cooper, Wythall, nr Alvechurch, out of business. Pet Oct 29, 1862. Birm, Aug 3 at 12. Fitter, Birm.

Perkins, Thos, Stanford, Oxford, Baker. Pet July 16. Banbury, July 30 at 10. Peller, Banbury.

Place, Edward, Scruton, York, Carpenter. Pet July 14. Northallerton, Aug 1 at 10. Teale, Leyburn.

Reynolds, Howell, Neath, Glamorgan, Colliery Proprietor. Pet July 18. Bristol, July 31 at 11. Clifton & Brooking, Bristol.

Shields, Joseph Wm, St Matthew's, Ipswich, Accountant. Pet July 16. Ipswich, Aug 1 at 11. Moore, Ipswich.

Simmonds, Wm, Stourbridge, Worcester, Pork Butcher. Pet July 17. Stourbridge, Aug 7 at 10. Maltby, Dudley and Stourbridge.

Slip, Edward, Bath, Oil and Colourman. Pet July 18. Bristol, July 31 at 11. Bartram, Bath.

Therley, Wm, Kingston-upon-Hull, Innkeeper. Pet July 16. Kingston-upon-Hull, Aug 5 at 12. Bond & Barwick, Leeds.

Webb, Edmund, Portwood, Southampton, Innkeeper. Pet July 15. Southampton, Aug 12 at 12. Mackey, Southampton.

Williams, Thos, Fleur-de-Lis, Monmouth. Pet July 16. Bristol, July 31 at 11. Brittan, Bristol.

BANKRUPTCY ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, July 17, 1863.

Clubb, John Wm, Tylor-st, Regent-st, Fishmonger. July 14.

BANKRUPTCY IN IRELAND.

Conway, Thos, Templemore, Leather Seller. To surr July 28 and Aug 14.

Cooper, Geo, Bray, Dublin, Plumber. To surr July 28 and Aug 14.

Hayes, John, Killynery, Kerry, Grocer. To surr July 31 and Aug 18.

McKnight, David, Lisburn, Grocer. To surr July 31 and Aug 14.

Shera, Joseph, Mohill, Draper. To surr July 31 and Aug 18.

THE WEEKLY REPORTER.—Upwards of 1,000 cases have already been published in the thirty-seven Numbers of the current Volume (XL) of the WEEKLY REPORTER, each number containing cases decided in the early part of the current week.

The Reports are not mere notes or incomplete memoranda of cases, but are full and sufficient for every purpose of the practitioner.

The Volume consists of fifty-two Numbers. Price £2 12s., free by post when paid in advance.

Office of the "Solicitors' Journal," 59, Carey Street, W.C.

DEBENTURES at 5, 5½, and 6 per CENT.— CEYLON COMPANY LIMITED. Subscribed Capital, £350,000.

DIRECTORS.

Lawford Acland, Esq., Chairman.
Sir James D. H. Elphinstone, Bart., M.P.
Harry George Gordon, Esq.
George Ireland, Esq.

Duncan James Kay, Esq.
Stephen P. Kennard, Esq.
Patrick F. Robertson, Esq.
Robert Smith, Esq.
Sir S. Villiers Surtees, K.B.

The Directors of the CEYLON COMPANY LIMITED, being authorised by a resolution of the shareholders, at the General Meeting of the company, held in London on the 4th day of April, 1863, to borrow a sum of money not exceeding the unpaid portion of their Subscribed Capital, are prepared to issue debentures for one, three, and five years, at 5, 5½, and 6 per Cent. respectively, and for longer periods, as may be specially arranged.

The directors are also prepared to invest for constituents, at Colonial rates, Money on Mortgage in Ceylon and Mauritius, either with or without their guarantee, as may be arranged.

Applications for particulars to be made at the office of the company No. 12, Old Broad-street. By order,

JOHN ANDERSON, Secretary.

A N INDISPUTABLE LIFE POLICY IS ALTOGETHER DIFFERENT FROM AN ORDINARY LIFE POLICY.

It is different in meaning, construction, and effect, containing no conditions or limitations of any kind; while the validity of an ordinary Policy depends upon the result of an inquiry after the death of the life assured.

THE INDISPUTABLE LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY is the ONLY Company who grant Indisputable Policies.

Edinburgh: 13, Queen-street. ALEXANDER ROBERTSON, Manager.
London: 54, Chancery-lane. JAMES BENNETT, Sec. Secy.
Dublin: 6, Foster-place. FLETCHER and MEADE, Local Secretaries.

THE POLICIES OF THE BRITISH PRUDENTIAL ASSURANCE COMPANY afford unusual security, as they become immediately indisputable when assigned to a bond fide holder for valuable consideration to the extent of the assignee's claim for principal, interest, and costs, and after five years from their date are indisputable, even if not assigned. Annual income, £60,000; new premium income for 1863, £16,471 10s. 4d.—Chief offices, 35, Ludgate-hill, London.

HENRY HARBEN, Secretary.

THE LAW UNION INSURANCE COMPANY

LENDS FROM £100 to £10,000 (in one sum) ON MORTGAGE of Freeholds and Leaseholds, Life Interests, Reversions, &c., of adequate value.—Applications may be made to FRANK MCGREDY, Secretary, 126, Chancery-lane.

THE LANDS IMPROVEMENT COMPANY

(Incorporated by Special Act of Parliament in 1853), 2, Old Palace Yard, Westminster, S.W.—To Landowners, the Clergy, Estate Agents, Surveyors, &c., in England and Wales, and in Scotland. The Company advances money, unlimited in amount, for the following works of agricultural improvement, the whole outlay and expense in all cases being liquidated by a rent-charge for 25 years:—

1. Drainage, irrigation, and warping, embanking, enclosing, clearing, reclamation, planting for any beneficial purpose engines or machinery for drainage or irrigation.

2. Farm roads, tramways, and railroads for agricultural or farming purposes.

3. Jettyes or landing places on the sea coast, or on the banks of navigable rivers or lakes.

4. The erection of farm houses, labourers' cottages, and other buildings required for farm purposes, and the improvement of and additions to farm houses and other buildings for farm purposes.

Landowners assessed under the provisions of any Act of Parliament, Royal Charter, or Commission, in respect of any public or general works of drainage or other improvements, may borrow their proportionate share of the costs, and charge the same with the expenses of the lands improved.

No investigation of title is required, and the Company, being of a strictly financial character, do not interfere with the plans and execution of the works, which are controlled only by the Government Enclosure Commissioners.

For further information and for forms of application, apply to the Hon. WILLIAM NAPIER, Managing Director, 2, Old Palace-yard, Westminster, S.W.

MARRIAGE LAW REFORM ASSOCIATION.

Instituted for the exclusive object of Promoting the Passing of an Act to render Lawful Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister.—Information respecting the law applicable to these Marriages, in this and foreign countries, may be obtained on application, personally or by letter, at the offices of the Association; where may also be had numerous publications, showing the opinions of eminent statesmen, divines, and others, in favour of the repeal of the present prohibition. There is now no known country in the world, except our own, where a man may not contract a lawful marriage with his deceased wife's sister.

JOSEPH STANSBURY, M.A., Hon. Sec.

No. 21, Parliament-street, S.W., London, June, 1863.

WEEKLY REPORTER.—WANTED.—The First Four Volumes of the Weekly Reporter. State condition and price to ALPHA, care of Mr. Day, 13, Carey-street.

TO THE LEGAL PROFESSION.—SHIRTS.

unequalled for Quality and Accuracy of Fit. Sizes registered for Future Orders. FAMILY HOSIERY in Stockings, Socks, Vests, and Drawers of the Best Descriptions and Newest Styles in every material for the season. Also, ELASTIC STOCKINGS of the best quality for Varicose Veins, Supporting Belts, &c. FOYE & PLANTE, 4, Waterloo-place, Pall Mall, London, S.W.

00.

sed
n-
of
are
it
ily

dal
th-
by
.

IS

ndi-
ary
life
any

ger.

es.

AL
ome
able
rest,
not
863,

y.

NY
C ul
nate
128,

TY
ace
nts,
any
cul-
qui-

ing,
for

ing

avi-

ngs
to

ent.

orks

nate

ands

ctly

the

is-

ion.

min-

ON,

g of

for-

eign

the

ons.

row

ntry

erful

c. c.

irst

and

TS,

for

and

l for

scow

Full